

Also, petition of Sierra Madre Club, of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the passage of the Pickett bill relative to the petroleum industry, etc.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of Sierra Madre Club, of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the Pickett bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Felix Angus Garrison, No. 4, Army and Navy Union, of Baltimore, Md., against general desertion bills—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Protests of the United Engineering and Foundry Company, of Pittsburgh, and the Carnegie Steel Company, of Duquesne, Pa., against the enactment of House bill 21334—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Iron City Electric Company, Pittsburgh Testing Laboratory, United Engineering and Foundry Company, and Samuel A. Taylor, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., and the National Lime Manufacturing Company, of Riverton, Va., in relation to placing the structural materials testing work under the Bureau of Standards, and reducing the appropriation for the same to \$50,000—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Dennis Sullivan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petitions of M. Olsen and 8 others, of Madelia; A. A. Querle and 8 others, of Windom; and Woodard & Kinch Company and 12 others, of Fairmont, all in the State of Minnesota, favoring Senate bill 3776, to amend the act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of 14 citizens of Campbell, Cal., indorsed by Orchard City Grange, No. 333, Patrons of Husbandry, of that place, for Senate bill 6931, for an appropriation of \$500,000 for extension of work of the Office of Public Roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of board of trustees of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, opposing adoption by the United States Senate of an amendment to the act to regulate commerce, introduced by Senator Dixon, of Montana, the long-and-short-haul clause—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEALD: Petition of citizens of Newcastle County, Del., for an amendment to the Constitution enabling women to vote—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Lindley Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition of Ladies of the Maccabees of the World of Salt Lake City, Utah, for amendment of House bill 21321, in the interest of fraternal periodicals as second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KRONMILLER: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Frank J. Donohoe and William B. McElden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John Graham (H. R. 25550)—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petition of Ashfield Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, in support of Senate bill 6931, providing an appropriation of \$500,000 to extend the work of improving the public highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NICHOLLS: Petition of the Young Men's Christian Association, of Scranton, Pa., for the Burkett-Sims bills (S. 225 and H. R. 2160) and for the Curtis-Miller interstate liquor bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Mechanicsburg, Philadelphia, Warren, Marysville, and Delaware County, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution enabling women to vote—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of Post No. 415, Grand Army of the Republic, of Mechanicsburg, Pa., for increase of pensions to veterans of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Petition of Ladies of the Maccabees of the World residing in Sylvania, Ohio, for amendment of House bill 21321, in the interest of fraternal periodicals as second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Ladies of the Maccabees of the World residing in Sylvania, Ohio, in support of Senate bill 6931, providing an appropriation of \$500,000 to extend the work of improving the public highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Phil McKernan Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Mason, Mich., against retention of the Lee statue in Statuary Hall—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of J. M. Donaldson, of Pontiac, and T. H. McGee and other business men of Farmington, Oakland County,

all in the State of Michigan, against parcels-post legislation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SWASEY: Petition of Pine Tree Council, No. 31, Royal Arcanum, of Lewiston, Me., favoring House bill 17543—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Vinalhaven, Me., for Senate bill 6931, for an appropriation of \$500,000 for extension of work of the Office of Public Roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Paris Grange, No. 44, of Paris; Upton Grange, No. 404, of Upton; and Stevens Mills Grange, No. 294, of Auburn, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of Maine, against repeal of the present oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of Denver (Colo.) Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, for retention of the Division of Information in the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization of the Department of Commerce and Labor—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Ladies of the Maccabees of the World, of Lamar, Colo., for amendment of House bill 21321, in the interest of fraternal periodicals as second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, May 14, 1910.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present. If a few of us have to come over here early every morning, the others should.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that there be a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following gentlemen failed to answer to their names:

Adamson	D. A. Driscoll	Knowland	Reynolds
Aiken	Durey	Lafean	Rhinoek
Alexander, N. Y.	Edwards, Ky.	Lamb	Riordan
Allen	Esch	Langham	Rodenberg
Ames	Fairchild	Langley	Rucker, Colo.
Anderson	Ferris	Law	Rucker, Mo.
Ansberry	Focht	Lawrence	Saunders
Anthony	Foelker	Legare	Scott
Ashbrook	Fordney	Lever	Sharp
Austin	Foss, Ill.	Lindsay	Sheffield
Barchfeld	Foss, Mass.	Loud	Sherley
Barclay	Foster, Ill.	Loudenslager	Sherwood
Bell, Ga.	Foulkrod	Lowden	Simmons
Bennet, N. Y.	Fowler	Lundin	Small
Bennett, Ky.	Gaines	McCall	Smith, Cal.
Bowers	Gallagher	McCreary	Smith, Iowa
Bradley	Gardner, Mass.	McDermott	Snapp
Brantley	Gardner, N. J.	McHenry	Southwick
Broussard	Garner, Pa.	McKinley, Ill.	Sparkman
Burke, Pa.	Gill, Md.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stafford
Burleigh	Gill, Mo.	McMorran	Stanley
Burleson	Gillett	Madden	Steenerson
Byrd	Gilmore	Malby	Sterling
Calder	Glass	Maynard	Stevens, Minn.
Calderhead	Goldfogle	Mays	Sturgiss
Capron	Graham, Ill.	Miller, Kans.	Sulloway
Carlin	Graham, Pa.	Moore, Pa.	Sulzer
Carter	Griest	Morehead	Talbot
Cocks, N. Y.	Gronna	Morgan, Mo.	Taylor, Colo.
Cole	Hamill	Morgan, Okla.	Taylor, Ohio
Conry	Hammond	Moxley	Tener
Cook	Haugen	Mudd	Thomas, Ohio
Cooper, Pa.	Hay	Murdock	Tilson
Coudrey	Heald	Murphy	Tirrell
Covington	Higgins	O'Connell	Wallace
Cowles	Hill	A. M. Palmer	Wanger
Cox, Ohio	Hinshaw	H. W. Palmer	Washburn
Craig	Howard	Parker	Weeks
Cravens	Howell, Utah	Parsons	Weisse
Creager	Hubbard, W. Va.	Patterson	Wheeler
Crow	Hughes, W. Va.	Peters	Willett
Currier	Hull, Iowa	Plumley	Wilson, Ill.
Davidson	Humphrey, Wash.	Poindexter	Wilson, Pa.
Davis	Humphreys, Miss.	Pou	Wood, N. J.
Denby	Jamieson	Pratt	Woodyard
Dent	Joyce	Prince	Young, N. Y.
Dickson, Miss.	Kennedy, Ohio	Randall, Tex.	
Douglas	Kinhead, N. J.	Randsell, La.	
Draper	Knapp	Reid	

The SPEAKER. There are 198 gentlemen present; a quorum. Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that all further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF LANDS, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged report (No. 1357), which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 690.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish to the House of Representatives the report of the director of lands of the Philippine Islands for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, we are all indebted to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] for securing the presence of a quorum to consider this important resolution, which is one of the daily series offered by my friend from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN]. I demand the previous question on the resolution and all amendments thereto to final passage.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does not the gentleman think that he should have his own people here, so that we would not waste all of this time in getting a quorum?

Mr. OLMSTED. We were in committee considering some further resolutions from the same gentleman at the time the call of the House was ordered, thus requiring our attendance here. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

SAN JOSE FRIAR ESTATE, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I also present the following privileged report (No. 1358), which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 689.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish to the House of Representatives copies of the following documents:

(a) The agreement mentioned in the cablegram of Governor-General Forbes, of the Philippine Islands, to the Secretary of War on November 29, 1909, to sell to E. L. Poole or his nominees the San Jose friar estate, island of Mindoro, Philippine Islands.

(b) The final agreement or instrument of sale of said lands.

(c) All drafts, memoranda, and other data, or statements in writing, furnished or used in connection with the making up of said agreement to sell, and said instrument of sale.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, we are in favor of the utmost publicity—

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman a question. I notice this is a demand, an imperative direction, to the Secretary of War to furnish to the House certain documents. Is that usual? My impression was that in such cases as this we ought to put in the usual clause, "if not incompatible with public interests." I do not understand that the House has an absolute right to demand or direct a Cabinet officer to furnish such information as we may think we need.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, it is quite customary to put in that clause, but sometimes it has been omitted. It so happened that I saw the Secretary of War here at the Capitol yesterday and showed him this resolution. He expressed not the slightest objection to furnishing that information, so I did not think it worth while to take up the time of the House by considering an amendment.

Mr. KEIFER. I do not like the precedent.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, before that question is taken I desire to ask the gentleman a question. Are there any more of these resolutions anywhere that the gentleman knows of?

Mr. OLMSTED. Yes; some more were pending under consideration before our committee this morning when the call of the House brought us into the Chamber. I think there are four or five more.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to suggest to the gentleman that if the Committee on Insular Affairs has not sufficient clerical force, it better ask for an additional clerk to see if it can not consolidate these resolutions into one, and not fritter away the time of the House by introducing already seven, I think it is, with enough more pending to make a dozen.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when gentlemen who want information respecting conditions in the Philippine Islands ought to get together all of the points of information that they want and put them in one resolution. This thing of having resolutions come in every day and every day—

Mr. TAWNEY. Why does not the gentleman report them to lie upon the table?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is what I was going to suggest. Coming in every day in this form, I think, is at least question-

able business. It occurs to me that the Committee on Insular Affairs would be justified in recommending that every other resolution of this character do lie upon the table. If gentlemen want information, let them collect what they need and embody it in one resolution, and then let the House act upon it. This makes how many now—six?

Mr. OLMSTED. Seven.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Seven that the House has acted upon touching the same general subject, and, as I understand it, a number of others are pending. I do not believe in trifling away the time of the House in this fashion.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how the gentleman from Indiana got the floor—

Mr. OLMSTED. I have the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. But if the gentleman from Indiana wants to table any of these resolutions, let him do so.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I have still a further privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution. (Report No. 1354.)

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 691.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives with a true copy of the letter mentioned in the cablegram of General Edwards, Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, to Governor-General Forbes, at Manila, on October 22, 1909, as having been written by General Edwards to Governor-General Forbes on September 27, 1909, requesting detailed description of such estates as were to be sold as unoccupied land, but which letter does not appear with the information transmitted to the House with General Edwards's letter of April 11, 1909, and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 14, 1909.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the same series, and I demand the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. OLMSTED. I have yet one more, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution. (Report No. 1355.)

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 692.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives the following information:

A true copy of the letter written from the Insular Bureau in the War Department on or about September 4, 1909, to the law firm of Strong & Cadwalader, of New York City, relative to the friar lands in the Philippine Islands and the laws pertaining thereto, and the original letter of reply of the firm of Strong & Cadwalader to the foregoing letter from the Bureau of Insular Affairs.

Mr. OLMSTED. This is another, Mr. Speaker, of the same series, and upon it I demand the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

SUNDY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 25552), the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 25552), the sundry civil appropriation bill, Mr. MANN in the chair.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORNES].

Mr. FORNES. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking unanimous consent, under the rules, to insert in the RECORD a very able editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Item on May 7. It relates to a bill which I introduced some time ago in reference to establishing a United States national bank. I feel convinced that if the members of the committee, to whom the bill was referred, will read the editorial carefully, it will cause them to give due consideration to the matter and no doubt make an early and favorable report upon the bill. I feel that the proposition is so important that it is high time that Congress should take into consideration the establishment of a stable and at all times reliable banking system, and I trust that the article will receive that consideration which its merits deserve. I ask unanimous consent to have it published in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to publish the matter in the RECORD to which

he referred. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The article referred to is as follows:

FOR CURRENCY REFORM.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., May 7, 1910.

Hon. CHARLES V. FURNES, of New York City, the 22d ultimo, introduced in Congress a bill for "the establishment of a United States National Bank of America necessary to the stability of trade and commerce." This is the greatest strictly financial question now before the American people, for it relates to a sufficiency of our currency supply to carry on business in ordinary times, as well as to the prevention of money panics at extraordinary times.

Mr. FURNES, formerly president of the board of aldermen and at times acting mayor of New York City in the last administration, a successful dry-goods merchant of that city, is eminently qualified to introduce this great subject.

Mr. FURNES rightly puts the blame for the tremendous evils of the 1907 panic, as well as preceding panics of the same kind, upon the shoulders of our currency system.

To remedy these periodical disasters he introduces his bill.

He also introduced a similar bill in the last or Sixtieth Congress, and reintroduced it in this Congress December 14, 1909, and the present bill is a revision of the former two.

Since the passage of the emergency currency law, Congress has done very little in remedying defects in our currency and banking laws which then were described as being harassing in the extreme.

It is said in extenuation that most Congressmen openly confess inability of experience to cope with a financial revision of our currency laws—even Senator ALDRICH confesses ignorance—consequently they refrain from tackling the question.

But that lack of experience need not cause such silence, for questions on the floors of Congress are in order, and would cause answers to pour in from those who are experienced, and such answers being thoroughly debated and compared, it would not be long before some pretty good and exact knowledge of the subject would be obtained.

Mr. FURNES's bill is a good starter. Many Congressmen doubtless in time would seek to amend it, for there are features of it that may require greater fields and economies covered than are there obtained.

At any rate, Congress should begin the arguments on this vital question at once, merely to gain a better view of the needs of commerce on this head. For to-day we are running needless risks of calamitous trouble, which may by prudence and good sense be eliminated the moment Government says the word.

Mr. FURNES's bill calls for a \$100,000,000 capitalized national bank at Washington, having branches in New York, Chicago, New Orleans, Boston, Denver, St. Louis, Atlanta, Ga., San Francisco, Portland, Oreg., and Cincinnati. We do not know why this great city was left out.

This bank is to do business with other banks and not transact business with individual customers, as does one of our national banks.

In that some claim that its field should be broadened to do a deposit and bank of discount business with individual customers, and to that end have many additional branches.

Along general lines, this bill establishes another emergency currency measure, and of a like sum of \$500,000,000, and with extra costs of a like nature—but less in amount—attached, upon those seeking to utilize it.

In that feature, a critic asks: "Why may the Treasury or the Government not do the same thing without all the red tape and expense and diverted profits of it all contained in the bank in this bill?"

Congress can answer that critic's question.

The bank's capital is subscribed for, three-fifths by the Government and two-fifths by national banks.

The Government's subscription being obtained from a sale of \$60,000,000 3 per cent bonds, fifty years to run.

The Government's interest would be personally represented on the directorate by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller, and the Treasurer of the United States, each having one-third of the total allotted government votes.

The directorate has 25 members, 22 of them being elected by the stockholders outside of the Government, each stockholder being entitled to one vote, shares being \$1,000 par value. This, of course, puts the controlling votes in the hands of the three government officers or their deputies.

Three of the directors must be residents of New York, three of Chicago, and two each in the other cities named; a director must not be less than 30 years old, and when two directors are elected a representative of each of the two dominant political parties shall be elected. That is a good point. Where three are elected, at least one shall be an adherent of one of the aforesaid mentioned parties.

That provision tends to overcome the claim that such a bank would become a party appendage.

The Secretary of the Treasury is to be chairman of the board, which board is to meet at least every three months at Washington. Members to get \$5,000 a year and expenses.

All of which is most reasonable.

No division of this bank is allowed to participate in syndicates or underwritings, and no member of the board or other officer can borrow of it.

At first, \$100,000,000 bank notes are to be issued for currency. The capital of the bank securing their redemption. This, it is said, leaves the bank without any working capital unimpaired. But it needs none.

Any bank or trust company may obtain this bank currency by a cost of one-eighth of 1 per cent tax, and interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum for one year or less, upon giving good security.

A further issue of like bank currency of \$400,000,000 may be made available in a similar way, except the rate of interest is gradually increased—as is the case with the present emergency currency law—up to 10 per cent. But even that increase has the great advantage of being only less than half of that called for in the emergency law.

Another critic says: "If there is anything in the shape of economy in government-owned semipublic utilities, it should begin in our currency issue and in its distribution to commerce."

But Congress will probably discuss that last point when it gets to it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL].

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call to the attention of this Congress a very recent decision of a federal court in Kentucky. In my opinion, this case will be one of interest

to every lawyer in this House, and should be very carefully studied by every Member who represents an agricultural district.

At the outset I desire to say that I am not a lawyer. I am a farmer; and I might add that I am proud of my vocation. [Applause.]

I consider farming an honorable and noble calling. I regret that farmers as a rule do not realize the dignity and importance of their business. However, I am hopeful of a better day, and my main purpose in addressing the House now is to hasten the coming of that day.

During the last two months eight Kentucky farmers have been indicted, tried, and convicted in a federal court in Kentucky under the Sherman antitrust law and have been fined from \$100 to \$1,000 each. I desire to go into detail regarding this case, to show who is back of this persecution (not prosecution), to point out the purpose of this suit against these farmers, and to ask this Congress for a remedy against any future miscarriage of justice. I state the case not in my own words, but read the following from the Cincinnati Enquirer of April 17:

EIGHT TOBACCO MEN CONVICTED OF INTERFERING WITH MOVEMENT OF BURLY SHIPMENTS—ALL ESCAPE JAIL SENTENCES, BUT EACH ONE GETS A FINE—IT TOOK THE JURY EIGHT MINUTES TO AGREE ON THEIR GUILT—COURT IS LENIENT.

Eight of the most prominent, influential financial men and tobacco growers of Grant County, Ky., were yesterday afternoon found guilty on three counts in the federal court of the eastern district of Kentucky, now in session in Covington, for alleged violation of the interstate-commerce law in restraint of trade, probably the first verdict of the kind which involves producers and farmers.

The case began last Thursday morning, Special Assistant to the Attorney-General E. P. Grosvenor, District Attorney George Du Ruelle, of Louisville, Ky., and Assistant District Attorney George H. Davidson appearing for the prosecution. The defense was represented by attorneys Harvey Myers, Worth Dickerson, and R. H. Winn. For two days the Government placed witnesses on the stand to prove that the defendants conspired in preventing the shipment of four hogheads of tobacco consigned to the Globe Tobacco Warehouse in Cincinnati from Dry Ridge, Ky., by W. T. Osborne, a tobacco grower.

EIGHT OF THEM GUILTY.

It was shortly after 2 o'clock when the jury was assigned to its room by Marshal A. B. Patrick.

At 3.20 the jury filed into the court room. Clerk Joseph Finnell called the names of the defendants and the names of the jurors.

Unfolding the document that contained the verdict, the clerk read it out aloud.

We, the jury, find John S. Steers, A. C. Webb, J. S. Carter, Perry Simpson, H. L. Conrad, R. Lee Conrad, Fred K. Conrad, and John Caldwell guilty, and dismiss the charges against Marion Bennett, John Calender, and I. N. Newton Conrad, the indictment against William Mulligan being nolleed Friday.

Judge Cochran said:

Inasmuch as no individual has been sentenced to jail in the tobacco-combine prosecutions I will not send any of these defendants to jail. It pains me to have to fine such men as you on account of your good standing in the community.

John S. Steers was fined \$1,000; Perry Simpson, A. C. Webb, and Jerry S. Carter, \$500 each; the Conrad brothers (H. L., Fred K., and R. L.), \$300 each, and John Caldwell, \$100.

Judge Cochran allowed the men fined to go on their own recognizances to give their attorneys time to determine what they intend to do.

I quote also from the Courier-Journal of the same date:

CONVICTED IN FEDERAL COURT—EIGHT GRANT COUNTY TOBACCO GROWERS FINED—VIOLATED LAW GOVERNING INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PREVENTED SHIPMENT OF CROP TO CINCINNATI—CASE WILL BE APPEALED.

COVINGTON, KY., April 16.

Eight Grant County (Ky.) farmers were found guilty of conspiracy in restraint of trade by a jury in the United States district court here late to-day. Of the 12 men indicted 1 was dismissed by order of Federal Judge Cochran and 3 others were acquitted on the verdict rendered by the jury this afternoon.

The defendants convicted were alleged to have interfered with interstate commerce by "intimidating and persuading" W. T. Osborne, also a Grant County farmer, to withdraw from shipment a lot of tobacco consigned to the Cincinnati market from the station at Dry Ridge, Ky.

FINES FROM \$1,000 TO \$100 EACH.

Fines varying from \$1,000 to \$100 each were assessed. The heaviest penalty imposed by the court upon any of the men was a fine of \$1,000, which was placed upon the Rev. John S. Steers. He is the cashier of the Farmers' Bank of Equity, of Dry Ridge, a minister, and Grant County's representative in the Kentucky legislature.

Perry Simpson, A. C. Webb, and Jerry S. Carter were fined \$500 each; H. L. Conrad, F. K. Conrad, and R. L. Conrad were fined \$300 each; and John W. Caldwell was fined \$100. The

men dismissed to-day were Marion Bennett, Isaac Conrad, and John Callender. William Mulligan was dismissed yesterday before the case went to the jury. All of the men are prominent in Grant County.

FIRST EFFORT OF GOVERNMENT.

The prosecution in these cases marked the first efforts upon the part of the Federal Government to take a hand in dealing with alleged night-rider outrages.

JUDGE DU RELLE TOOK PART.

The evidence for the Government was worked up by H. W. Hoagland—and I am very sorry to say here, and regret it very much, that this gentleman has passed to the great beyond just within the last few days in this city—a special representative of the Department of Justice; and in addition to United States District Attorney Tinsley, Assistant Attorney-General Grosvenor, from Washington, and United States District Attorney Du Relle, of the Western Kentucky district, were also engaged on the side of the prosecution.

I quote from the Cincinnati Times-Star relative to the indictment:

SURPRISE SPRUNG IN TOBACCO INQUIRY—GOVERNMENT'S INVESTIGATION TAKES COURSE THAT WAS NOT EXPECTED—JUDGE'S INSTRUCTIONS ARE ALONG INTERSTATE-COMMERCE LAW—BELIEVED THAT FEDERAL JURY SOON WILL REPORT INDICTMENT.

The bomb which the Government has been preparing for certain members of the Burley Tobacco Society, who are believed to be responsible for the Kentucky night-rider outrages, the material for which has been gathered for the last four months by a small army of secret government agents, burst Thursday. Incidentally, it was a different sort of bomb from that expected and its splinters flew in a direction entirely different to that anticipated.

Judge Cochran directed the jury to retire, telling them that, in his opinion, they could finish their business before night.

The law provides that the jury may contain from 16 to 23 men. Seventeen is the number on the present jury, all from the mountain counties of Kentucky, where there is practically no tobacco grown.

Also no Democrats, I might add.

Assistant Attorney-General E. P. Grosvenor has charge of the prosecution, assisted by Assistant District Attorney Davidson. With them are H. M. Hoagland, A. Bruse Bielaski, and a score of sleuths who worked up the cases. All were smilingly noncommittal when asked regarding the Government's real plans. "Sorry, but I can't say anything yet," was Grosvenor's rejoinder.

I now quote from a signed statement of the Rev. John S. Steers, one of the men convicted. Now, I copied this from a signed statement of the Rev. John S. Steers, whose letter I have in my possession, who was the man who was fined \$1,000. I will state to this House that I wrote to him that I wanted the actual facts in the case, and I have a signed statement from him as a citizen and as a minister of the gospel, citing the exact facts in this case. The incident upon which he was convicted happened two and a half years ago.

The facts in brief are these: In the fall of 1907 Mr. W. T. Osborne was solicited to pool his tobacco. He refused, kindly but positively. Then he proposed and promised to R. L. Conrad and several others of our good men that he would hold his tobacco until the 1907 pool was sold. We believed him sincere, and trusted him to hold his tobacco.

Some time in November, 1907, he prized the tobacco, and in the week of the 29th of November he hauled it to the Dry Ridge depot and received a bill of lading for shipment to Cincinnati.

This tobacco was in depot several days, and on Thanksgiving Day, November 28, 1907, a meeting of our local was called; a general rumor seemed to be going the rounds that something might happen to this tobacco that night. I and many others made talks urging peace, law, and order, and some one suggested that a committee be sent to see Mr. Osborne, to see if he would yet hold his tobacco. Then his best friends were looked for, and J. S. Carter, a brother-in-law of said Osborn, and A. C. Webb, a lifelong neighbor and friend, were made a committee to go at once and see what he would do.

A young man, Hugh Lee Conrad, furnished a rig and drove it, so the three—Conrad, Webb, and Carter—drove out to see him, and the rest of us waited at the lodge for their return. They reported a very pleasant, social meeting with Mr. Osborne; they told him what the general rumor was and he said, "He was already uneasy about it and thought he had made a mistake." He was asked to take it back home, but would not do it. Then they proposed he let them put it in some place and hold it here; to this he said, "No; I won't do that, but if you will haul it back to my barns, I will let it lay there until you say for me to sell it." To this the committee agreed, and all separated as the best of friends. Osborne followed them to the road and thanked them and invited all back to see him.

The local received the news with rejoicing and all going home feeling very kindly toward Mr. Osborne. On the next morning 200 or 300 men, some on foot, some on horseback, and some in buggies, and four wagons met at depot, loaded the four hogsheds of tobacco on four wagons and had a little parade and marched two and two toward Mr. Osborne. The tobacco was delivered in good shape and a general good feeling, love feast, engaged in by all present. If there was a threat made by anyone I never heard it nor heard of it. We were unable to even locate the rumor. I called on the local to know if there was a man in the house who knew of anyone who would likely do violence or make any threats against Mr. Osborne or his tobacco, and I failed to find any, only several seemed to have heard the rumor, but could not tell where or from whom.

J. G. STEERS.

For fear that my statements might be considered governed by prejudice, I have quoted from the public press as above.

These papers are not printed where these convicted men live and they have no personal interest in the matter.

I now quote from the Louisville Post, which was the original Taft paper in Kentucky. I have heard it rumored that it is not now so strong for President Taft as it was a year ago. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I now read from that paper:

LOUISVILLE PAPER ON TOBACCO INDICTMENTS—EVENING POST DISCUSSES THE CASE OF TWELVE GRANT COUNTY FARMERS—NO VIOLENCE SHOWN—INTERSTATE-COMMERCE LAW NOT BROKEN AND NO RIGHTS ARE INVADDED.

Twelve men, residents of Dry Ridge, Ky., have been indicted by the federal grand jury at Covington for "conspiracy in the restraint of trade" and "issuing threats" to W. T. Osborne, a tobacco farmer at that place, in endeavoring to induce him to pool his tobacco instead of selling it independently.

The allegations are that in November, 1907, W. T. Osborne delivered to O. G. Ramsey, station agent of the Cincinnati Southern at Dry Ridge, four hogsheds of tobacco for shipment to Cincinnati; that these men assembled at the station, made threats and offers of violence to frighten Ramsey and prevent him from shipping the tobacco; that they afterwards sought to compel Osborne to remove his tobacco from the station; and that they "conspired to remove the tobacco from the station, and by threats and offers of violence gave him to understand that his tobacco should not be sold. It is further contended that these threats and actions were successful, and that Osborne, intimidated, declined to ship his tobacco independently.

II.

There are two accusations in this indictment. The first is interference with interstate commerce. The second is the use of force, fraud, and threats.

Violence, expressed or implied, may be an offense against the state law, punishable in the state courts and not subject to punishment in the federal courts. But no violence was done; no overt act was required to induce Osborne to change his mind.

The supreme question in this matter is: "Was there any interference with interstate commerce through a combination or conspiracy formed for the purpose of restraining interstate commerce?"

If these acts of these Grant County men be as described, then it is an interference with interstate commerce to use business inducements, considerations, influences, to induce a tobacco raiser who prefers the Cincinnati market to change his Ohio market to a market in Kentucky.

We mean that if these men have violated the Sherman antitrust law the Board of Trade of Louisville would in like manner violate the Sherman antitrust law if they should send an excursion through the blue-grass country upon a missionary tour to induce merchants who have already consigned their tobacco to a Cincinnati warehouse to change its destination to a warehouse at Winchester, Lexington, or Louisville.

III.

The American Tobacco Company is a trust prophetically described by Senator Sherman in a speech delivered March 21, 1890, in which he said that the capitalists have invented "a new form of combination, which seeks to avoid competition by combining the controlling corporations, partnerships, and individuals engaged in the same business and placing the power and property of the combination under the government of a few individuals under the control of a single man called a trustee, a chairman, or a president. The sole object of such a combination is to make competition impossible. It can control the market, raise or lower prices as will best promote its selfish interests, reduce prices in a particular locality, and break down competition and advance prices at will where competition does not exist."

The work here described has gone on persistently throughout the tobacco regions. The producers of tobacco found themselves with but one purchaser. The agents of the tobacco company traversed the State, fixing prices arbitrarily, refusing concessions, and using every device known to power and greed for securing the raw product regardless of its cost or value.

IV.

The result of this crusade was a price for tobacco that was ruinous to the producer. Then the worm turned. An organization of producers was made under which tobacco was pooled, and the sale of the pooled tobacco put in the hands of selling agents to act for the farmers, confronting one purchaser with one seller.

There was in this no lawlessness, no invasion of the rights of other persons, no violation of an interstate commerce act or antitrust commerce act. It was the organized resistance of men within their lawful rights against the depredations of a lawless association, which the Federal Government had taken no steps to dissolve.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

One result of this combination was that the tobacco trust had to make some concession in regard to prices. They then sent their agents throughout the State to tempt men who had pooled their tobacco to violate their contracts, offering them an inducement to commit a wrong, and succeeding in many instances in inducing the holders of the tobacco from greed or necessity to violate their personal obligations to their associates.

Efforts were made by the tobacco raisers of Grant County to prevent Osborne from availing himself of the benefits of their work by disloyalty to their association. In so far as these methods were violent, they are subject to punishment by the state law, and we fail to see that in any manner they strengthen the contention that this persuasion, whatever the force back of it, was an offense under the federal statute. The federal courts have decided in the case of the Cincinnati, Portsmouth, Big Sandy and Pomeroy Packet Company v. Bay, rendered December 1, 1905, that "the contract is not to be assumed to contemplate unlawful results. Even if there is some interference with commerce, the contract is not necessarily void under the Sherman Act, if such interference is insignificant and merely incidental and not the dominant purpose."

If that be true concerning a contract, it is true concerning these actions. The purpose is not an interference with the interstate commerce. There is no proof that this tobacco of Osborne's after it was pooled did not enter into interstate commerce and was not sold finally at Cincinnati. The fact is that this pooled tobacco was finally purchased by the American Tobacco Company, a New Jersey corporation, and

transported to their different factories, there manufactured, and sold by their numerous agencies throughout the country, and became an important element in interstate commerce.

The purpose of the acts of these Grant County farmers was not an interference, but a protection of their personal property, an effort to secure a fair return for their personal labor, an attempt to exact from a trust, so graphically described by Mr. Sherman, recognition of individual rights and the safety of individual property.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

The prosecution in this case tries to make it appear that these men are lawless men; that the purpose of this suit—mind you in the federal court—is to punish night riders.

I know some of these men personally; upon my responsibility as a Member of this House, I state that they are as reputable men as live in Kentucky or in any other State of this Union.

As to their character I point to the statement of the judge who tried them, which statement I read in your hearing a few minutes ago.

Although almost inconceivable, it seems to be a fact that this case had its origin in the Department of Justice here at Washington.

A special term of the federal court was called at Covington, Ky., to indict these men on evidence dug up by government secret-service men in the employment of the Department of Justice. This case was directed by the masterful mind of the Hon. Wade Ellis, the great Napoleon of Ohio Republican politics. If I mistake not the signs, he will meet his Waterloo in November under the forces behind Governor Harmon. These farmers were indicted and tried and convicted by men who do not live in a farming country; who knew nothing of the culture of a tobacco crop. The men convicted were all growers of tobacco.

The men convicted live in a strong Democratic county; the jurymen convicting them were brought 200 miles from strong Republican counties. The facts connected with this case happened two and one-half years ago.

The Mr. Osborne in this case had never asked nor sought any redress from his neighbors in any court. The matter had long ago been forgotten. The Department of Justice comes with its secret-service force after scouring Kentucky with a fine-tooth comb and digs up this incident and proceeds to hurl the whole power of the federal court against these farmers.

The first question to present itself is: Why this prosecution of the tobacco farmer when the great trusts of the country proceed to rob and oppress the people and remain unpunished? As offering some light for the reason of prosecuting tobacco growers at the demand of the tobacco manufacturers, I read the following editorial from the Lexington (Ky.) Herald, concerning the honorable Assistant Attorney-General of the United States, who instituted this suit:

WADE HAMPTON ELLIS.

As an Assistant Attorney-General of the United States, carrying out a half-hearted policy of prosecution of the trusts, or as the chairman of the Republican state committee in Ohio, put in that place because the President was sick of the reverses brought upon his party because of the Cox-Taft-Burton machine, which replaced the old Foraker-Dick crowd, the Hon. Wade Hampton Ellis is not of much interest to Kentuckians. But as the man who is believed to be directly responsible for the attempt to declare the Burley Tobacco Society, and therefore all organizations whose object is to secure a living price for their products, to be trusts, he and his record as a public official become very properly matters for inquiry on the part of the people of Kentucky.

Back in the good old days when Cleveland was President the second time Ellis was a Democrat of Democrats in the good old town of Covington. Law cases being few, he moved to Kansas, where they were still fewer, and he returned to Covington. Some independent Republicans, tired of the arrogance and corruption of the Cox machine in Cincinnati and Hamilton County, headed by James M. Glenn, a wealthy capitalist, purchased the Cincinnati Tribune, a struggling morning daily, and turned it into a vigorous and persistent medium of opposition to gang rule in Cincinnati. Ellis had some experience as a reporter, and had made a good deal more of a success of it than he had achieved as a lawyer, and so Glenn and his associates put the high-minded young newspaper man from Covington at the head of their anti-Cox newspaper. And it should be noted, in justice to Ellis—and for future reference—that he made good as a tribune of the people, his editorial preachments having such an effect at the very next election after the establishment of the Tribune that the people of Cincinnati routed the Cox machine, horse, foot, and dragoon, and threw all the rascals out.

In that campaign, while Ellis did some excellent editorial work himself, the best arguments he used were reproduced

from the Cincinnati Times-Star, owned by Charles P. Taft, brother of William H. Taft, formerly an independent newspaper of the highest character, but later a subservient tool of the Cox machine. In any event, he won his fight, and decency triumphed in the Queen City. Ellis's paper prospered and Ellis's friends were in the city offices.

That was along in 1893. The new city solicitor, who was Ellis's relative, made him his assistant, he having laid down his editorial pen, and the future of the young reformer looked bright indeed. A lawyer who can not get any cases in private practice has a sure thing of cases as a public prosecutor, and as assistant city solicitor Ellis was assured of an income, regardless of the footsteps that passed his door. In the meantime the old Tribune was consolidated with the Commercial Gazette, made famous by Murat Halstead, and gradually the reform officials who had been elected on the tidal wave of public indignation against the Cox gang were also absorbed by the regular organization. In other words, most of the fellows who had been intrusted with the confidence of the people of Cincinnati in the city election betrayed that confidence by going over to the enemy.

Chief among these very men was Wade Hampton Ellis. It was not so very many months until there was another change in the offices in Cincinnati, the reformers of that good old town having the happy faculty of doing, as Grant said the Democratic party always did, the wrong thing at the right time, to such a degree that they have never carried two elections in succession within the memory of the oldest inhabitant; but Wade Hampton Ellis, having knelt at the Republican mourners' bench and having brought forth political fruits meet for repentance, was absolved from his former sins committed in the interest of the people of Cincinnati and held onto his job. In fact, he got quite close to Mr. Cox, whose eye is sharp and whose judgment is most excellent. He occupied one or two offices of minor importance and continued to grow in the graces of Mr. Cox until in 1903 the Cincinnati boss was given a representative on the Ohio state ticket, and he named Mr. Ellis for attorney-general.

When he left the office of attorney-general it was without any special record in any particular matter, but he had been the go-between for the Taft forces at Washington and in Ohio in the campaign waged by the former Secretary of War for the presidential nomination, and so he was rewarded by Taft by being made an Assistant Attorney-General of the United States.

In his old newspaper days at Cincinnati, Ellis, in fighting the Cox machine and in helping to elect the reform ticket, above referred to, had been of some influence in making E. O. Eshelby, now an independent tobacco manufacturer, city treasurer of Cincinnati. Eshelby later became the owner of the consolidated Commercial Tribune, and has always been a great admirer of Ellis, and very properly so. Eshelby and Ellis were in the same boat in going over to the Cox machine, and it is little wonder they were "as thick as thieves."

As an independent tobacco manufacturer, Mr. Eshelby has been compelled, along with other independents and the American Tobacco Company, to pay a fair price for the tobacco he obtained in Kentucky; and, by the way, he has a suit now pending against the Burley Tobacco Society for making him pay more than 8 cents a pound for tobacco. Well, after Ellis had been made Assistant Attorney-General, Editor Eshelby (not tobacco-manufacturer Eshelby, mind you) went to Washington and was interviewed upon the subject of Night Riders. He called attention to the fact (the farmers having better sense than to ship their tobacco to Cincinnati when they could get a better price for it in Lexington or Louisville) that the Burley Tobacco Society was a trust in restraint of trade. He called on the President, in whose favor he and his political associates had been responsible for the selection of the delegates from Hamilton County to the Republican national convention in his fight with Foraker in his home city. Soon after that came the first announcement that the Burley Tobacco Society would be the object of prosecution by the Federal Government.

The question that will interest every member of the farmers' organizations in Kentucky, as well as in Ohio and throughout the country, is this: Is William H. Taft lending his power, as Chief Magistrate of the Republic, to the petty purpose of rewarding the politicians who helped give him delegates to the Republican national convention? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Is the President permitting the Attorney-General's office to attempt the punishment as a trust of farmers whose sole and only offense has been the fixing of a price on their product which an arrogant and impudent trust had been forced to pay after years of extortion in fixing the price itself? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Is the President willing to go before the farmers of Ohio, in the campaign to be held in that State this fall, upon

the issue of whether the farmers have the right to fix the price of their products themselves, either singly or collectively? Is he willing to have brought into the limelight the records of the two worthies believed to be responsible for the prosecution of the Burley Tobacco Society—two men whom the people of their own town trusted—only to be betrayed to the enemy? Is he willing to tell the truth, as he did at Akron, Ohio, in the fall of 1905, about the Cox machine in Cincinnati and Hamilton County? All these questions being answered in the affirmative, Judson Harmon ought to be reelected governor of Ohio this fall by more than 100,000 majority, without another single issue in the campaign. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And I desire to call the attention of this House to the slander that have been heaped upon us by many newspapers of this Nation, who, when they speak of the organized farmers of Kentucky, the men who blazed the way and opened the door for the other people of this Nation, never failed to speak of them as Night Riders, though I stand here to affirm that they are of as high a type of citizenship as the farmers of any State of this Nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, in Kentucky we admire a man who contends in the open for his rights.

I do not blame Mr. Eshelby and other tobacco manufacturers for a desire to buy cheap tobacco, but I do emphatically denounce as unfair, unjust, and outrageous the action of high government officials in using the power of this Government to despoil the rights and property of tobacco growers to enrich the tobacco manufacturers of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In behalf of the American farmer, I demand a square deal. I warn now my colleagues upon this floor the American farmer is waking up; he is beginning to demand his rights, and he will soon be strong enough to have his way in writing the laws of this Nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I would hesitate to charge the President with being a party to this suit to oppress the farmers of the country, but I call your attention to the following article in the Commercial Tribune of Cincinnati on April 14. This paper is the official Republican paper in the President's home city and should know the President's attitude. It seems to speak with authority.

The Cincinnati Commerce Tribune of April 14, 1910, published, under the "scare" headline, in first column, first page, the following:

PERSISTENT WATCHING THE OUTCOME—CHIEF EXECUTIVE DEMANDS VIGOROUS PROSECUTION OF THE TOBACCO GROWERS' COMBINE DESPITE POLITICS—MAY MARK BEGINNING OF FIGHT ON NIGHT RIDERS—BURLEY SOCIETY, REALIZING THAT LIFE IS AT STAKE, PREPARES FOR STUBBORN FIGHT.

President Taft is watching with deep interest the outcome of the tobacco cases, the prosecution of which will begin this morning by special government attorneys, sent here from Washington, in the federal court at Covington, which, if successful, will mark the beginning of the end of the night riding in Kentucky.

It was at the suggestion of the President that the investigation of the cases was made. They are in reality his own.

In the face of the statement that the State of Kentucky would be lost to the Republicans if the prosecution of the cases took place, the President, it is said, ordered them to be made, declaring that in his opinion the law had been violated and politics should not be considered.

WITNESSES ARE GUARDED.

With a score of witnesses being guarded after they had been corralled by special agents of the Department of Justice, 12 prominent Grant County growers under indictment, Edwin P. Grosvenor, assistant to Attorney-General Wickersham, who will prosecute the cases, and an array of other legal talent from Washington here, the trials promise to be bitterly contested.

Much depends upon the outcome of the present trials. If the Government is successful, there will follow dozens of other trials of prominent Kentuckians. As though making a last stand, the Burley Tobacco Society is ready for a fierce conflict, and every condition indicates that it will be accorded them.

I call attention to the fact that just now we are beginning to pool the 1910 crop of tobacco in Kentucky. I ask the President if it is to be the policy of his Department of Justice to prevent the Kentucky farmer from pooling his crop. Everything connected with this suit seems to indicate that intention.

The cases of the American Tobacco Company and the Standard Oil Company are of such importance that the Supreme Court of the United States postpones them for a year and orders a reargument of the cases.

The case against the Kentucky farmers is made up and they are convicted in six weeks. Every fair-minded man must ask himself the question if the gold of the trusts is of more importance to the courts than the liberty and property of the American farmer. In behalf of the Kentucky farmers I protest against such inequality of justice.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption right there?

Mr. CANTRILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. JAMES. The editorial that the gentleman from Kentucky read was from the Cincinnati Tribune, a paper that is published in Cincinnati and circulates in Covington, which is virtually a part of Cincinnati, right across the river, and was read by the people right there who were trying that case at that time. Is not that true?

Mr. CANTRILL. I am satisfied that is correct; yes, sir. And it must have been published with the desire to influence this case.

How different is the President's attitude from that of his predecessor toward the farmer. I quote from ex-President Roosevelt's message to Congress on February 9, 1909. Says Mr. Roosevelt:

Yet farming does not yield either the profit or the satisfaction that it ought to yield, and may be made to yield. There is discontent in the country, and, in places, discouragement. Farmers as a class do not magnify their calling, and the movement to the towns, though, I am happy to say, less than formerly, is still strong. Those engaged in all other industrial and commercial callings have found it necessary, under modern economic conditions, to organize themselves for mutual advantage and for the protection of their own particular interests in relation to other interests. The farmers of every progressive European country have realized this essential fact, and have found in the co-operative system exactly the form of business combination they need. The co-operative plan is the best plan of organization wherever men have the right spirit to carry it out. Under this plan any business undertaking is managed by committee; every man has one vote, and only one vote; and everyone gets profits according to what he sells, or buys, or supplies. It develops individual responsibility and has a moral as well as a financial value over any other plan. Crop growing is the essential foundation; but it is no less essential that the farmer shall get an adequate return for what he grows; and it is no less essential—indeed, it is literally vital—that he and his wife and his children shall lead the right kind of life. From all that has been done and learned, three great general and immediate needs of country life stand out: First, effective cooperation among farmers, to put them on a level with the organized interests with which they do business.

I warn my countrymen that the great recent progress made in city life is not a full measure of our civilization; for our civilization rests at bottom on the wholesomeness, the attractiveness, and the completeness, as well as the prosperity, of life in the country. The men and women on the farms stand for what is fundamentally best and most needed in our American life. Upon the development of country life rests ultimately our ability, by methods of farming requiring the highest intelligence, to continue to feed and clothe the hungry Nation; to supply the city with fresh blood, clean bodies, and clear brain that can endure the terrific strain of modern life; we need the development of men in the open country, who will be in the future, as in the past, the stay and strength of the Nation in time of war and its guiding and controlling spirit in time of peace.

We have done exactly what President Roosevelt told us to do. Does President Taft intend to prosecute us for carrying out the recommendations of his predecessor? Is this to be another case of this administration turning its back upon the policies of the former administration?

The President owes it to the American farmer to define his attitude upon this subject. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I quote from another message of ex-President Roosevelt, sent to Congress on March 25, 1908, which has a direct bearing upon my bill, which I will read in a moment. I desire to thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] for calling my attention to it:

In addition to the reasons I have already urged on your attention, it has now become important that there should be an amendment of the antitrust law, because of the uncertainty as to how this law affects combinations among labor men and farmers, if the combination has any tendency to restrict interstate commerce. All of these combinations, if and while existing for and engaged in the promotion of innocent and proper purposes, should be recognized as legal. As I have repeatedly pointed out, this antitrust law was a most unwisely drawn statute. It was perhaps inevitable that in feeling after the right remedy the first attempts to provide such should be crude; and it was absolutely imperative that some legislation should be passed to control, in the interest of the public, the business use of the enormous aggregations of corporate wealth that are so marked a feature of the modern industrial world. But the present antitrust law, in its construction and working, has exemplified only too well the kind of legislation which, under the guise of being thoroughgoing, is drawn up in such sweeping form as to become either ineffective or else mischievous.

In the modern industrial world combinations are absolutely necessary; they are necessary among business men, they are necessary among laboring men, they are becoming more and more necessary among farmers. Some of these combinations are among the most powerful of all instruments for wrongdoing. Others offer the only effective way of meeting actual business needs. It is mischievous and unwholesome to keep upon the statute books unmodified a law, like the antitrust law, which, while in practice only partially effective against vicious combinations, has nevertheless in theory been construed so as sweepingly to prohibit every combination for the transaction of modern business. Some real good has resulted from this law. But the time has come when it is imperative to modify it. Such modification is urgently needed for the sake of the business men of the country, for the sake of the wage-workers, and for the sake of the farmers. The Congress can not afford to leave it on the statute books in its present shape.

It has now become uncertain how far this law may involve all labor organizations and farmers' organizations, as well as all business organizations, in conflict with the law; or, if we secure literal compliance with the law, how far it may result in the destruction of the organizations necessary for the transaction of modern business, as well as of all labor organizations and farmers' organizations, completely check the wise movement for securing business cooperation among farmers,

and put back half a century the progress of the movement for the betterment of labor. A bill has been presented in the Congress to remedy this situation. Some such measure as this bill is needed in the interest of all engaged in the industries which are essential to the country's well-being. I do not pretend to say the exact shape that the bill should take, and the suggestions I have to offer are tentative; and my views would apply equally to any other measure which would achieve the desired end. Bearing this in mind, I would suggest, merely tentatively, the following changes in the law:

The substantive part of the antitrust law should remain as at present; that is, every contract in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations should continue to be declared illegal; provided, however, that some proper governmental authority (such as the Commissioner of Corporations acting under the Secretary of Commerce and Labor) be allowed to pass on any such contracts. Probably the best method of providing for this would be to enact that any contract, subject to the prohibition contained in the antitrust law, into which it was desired to enter, might be filed with the Bureau of Corporations or other appropriate executive body. This would provide publicity. Within, say, sixty days of the filing—which period could be extended by order of the department whenever for any reason it did not give the department sufficient time for a thorough examination—the executive department having power might forbid the contract, which would then become subject to the provisions of the antitrust law, if at all in restraint of trade.

If no such prohibition was issued, the contract would then only be liable to attack on the ground that it constituted an unreasonable restraint of trade. Whenever the period of filing had passed without any such prohibition, the contracts or combinations could be disapproved or forbidden only after notice and hearing with a reasonable provision for summary review on appeal by the courts. Labor organizations, farmers' organizations, and other organizations not organized for purposes of profit, should be allowed to register under the law by giving the location of the head office, the charter and by-laws, and the names and addresses of their principal officers. In the interest of all these organizations—business, labor, and farmers' organizations alike—the present provision permitting the recovery of threefold damages should be abolished, and as a substitute therefor the right of recovery allowed for should be only the damages sustained by the plaintiff and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

Gentlemen of the House, I ask you this question: Did you ever hear of the Kentucky tobacco farmer being dragged into the federal courts and prosecuted and a verdict found with a jail sentence when tobacco was selling at 3 and 5 cents a pound? You never heard of it. [Applause.] But when the Kentucky farmer, by exactly following out what President Roosevelt told us to do, has organized, has gotten into a compact organization, and we have raised our prices from a starvation price of 5 cents to a profitable price of 16 cents, the Department of Justice at Washington comes down there and undertakes to put us into prison for so doing. I ask the farmers of this House if they ever heard of the prosecution of a bear pool on cotton? But when cotton begins to go up the Department of Justice undertakes to prosecute the farmers. [Applause.]

I ask, is it the policy of this administration to intimidate and browbeat the farmer of this country because he exercises his inherent right as a free American citizen to protect his right?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTRILL. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I want to ask the gentleman if those were criminal prosecutions?

Mr. CANTRILL. They were indicted under the criminal section.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I want to call the gentleman's attention and the committee's attention to the fact that it was asked during the debate on the railroad bill if criminal prosecutions had been successful under the Sherman antitrust law, and it was stated that no criminal prosecutions had been successful.

Mr. CANTRILL. They were indicted on three counts under the criminal section. The American Tobacco Company, as I understand it, was indicted under the civil section and was fined in the lower court. These Kentucky farmers were indicted under the criminal section, and three counts were returned against them, and the judge said the reason he did not send them to jail was because of their character and the further cause that no official of the tobacco trust had been sent to jail.

Gentlemen of the House, the farmer must be allowed to organize to protect himself and his family. Every other line of business and profession with which he does business is organized. To prosecute him for doing what every other man is doing I assert is unfair, unjust, and contrary to all laws of whatever source.

It was never the intention of the Sherman law to oppress the producers of farm products or laborers in the field, mine, or factory.

And right here I desire to call attention to the statement made by the gentleman from New Jersey on this floor a few days ago, when he went back into the debates of the Senate and read them before this House, showing that Senator Sherman himself denied upon the floor of the United States Senate that this bill was ever intended to apply to farmers and labor or-

ganizations. But the Senate was so afraid that the Sherman antitrust law would handicap the farmer, as the gentleman from New Jersey pointed out, and as I read the record that he pointed out to me yesterday, that Senator George, of Mississippi, introduced an amendment in the Senate, which was adopted, which in effect eliminated from the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law the farmers and laborers in this country. It was adopted by the Senate; but when the bill came back from conference that section was left out of it, and to follow out what we would like the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] has a similar bill in this House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILSON] has another bill, and I have introduced another, which is shorter, I believe, than those which, if enacted into law, will put back in the Sherman law as it was originally drafted by Senator Sherman and as it was originally passed by the United States Senate, a provision to exempt the farmers' unions and the labor unions from the operation of that law. [Applause.]

I warn my fellow-Members that the cotton grower, the fruit grower, the grain grower, the producers of live stock, the farmer of every description will soon be prosecuted for organizing in self-defense if the case I have called to your attention is affirmed in the higher courts. I consider that the farmers of this Nation are entitled to know where they stand; that they should not be handicapped by the uncertainty of the law nor be browbeaten or bulldozed by the courts of the land.

In order to make clear their rights, I introduced the bill H. R. 18400, now before the Judiciary Committee of this House, and I ask its earnest consideration by this committee and by the full membership of this House.

I read the bill:

A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, and being chapter 647, volume 26, United States Statutes at Large.

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, and being chapter 647 of volume 26 of the United States Statutes at Large, be amended by adding to the last section of said act the following:

"The provisions of this act shall in no case apply to any contract or combination in any form the purpose of which is to secure laborers or employees a reasonable compensation for their labor nor to any contract or combination in any form the purpose of which is to secure to growers or producers of agricultural products or live stock a reasonable price therefor, but such contracts and combinations are expressly exempted and excepted from the provisions of this act."

Now, gentlemen, I would not ask for the farmers in this country the right to organize and carry that organization into effect without some restraint upon them, because the farmers of this country have sufficient power to form a trust that would starve this Nation into submission at its feet. I would not give them that right to oppress the people who must consume farm products, and we do not ask for it in this bill. We simply ask a reasonable price, to combine for a reasonable price, and the farmer is entitled to a reasonable price. [Applause.] Did it ever occur to you, gentlemen, that the farmers of this country are under no legal or moral obligation to feed the balance of the world at an unprofitably low price? You pass legislation here every day to increase the profits of the manufacturers of this country; and do you propose to sit idly by and let the Department of Justice oppress the farmer because by his own efforts he secures a reasonable price for his product? [Loud applause.]

This bill was indorsed by the great convention of farmers held in St. Louis last week.

I read the following:

We, the representatives of the organized farmers of the United States in the American Society of Equity, believe that the purpose of the Sherman antitrust law was to protect the wage-earner and farmer from corporate greed and power: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the convention indorse House bill 18400, introduced by Mr. CANTRILL, of Kentucky, on January 17 in the National House of Representatives.

The Farmers' Union adopted the following resolution:

We deeply deprecate such a construction of the Sherman antitrust law as to render it formidable to the oppressed rather than to the oppressor, and we hear with amazement that in Kentucky a federal court has recently construed this law so as to punish tobacco growers, while the American Tobacco Company, so plainly and so long guilty of violations of this law, has so far escaped punishment.

[Applause.]

We hope that our Representatives in Congress will give this matter immediate consideration.

In behalf of the farmers of the Nation I ask the passage of this bill. If some legislation of this character is not enacted the farmers' organizations all over the country will soon be disrupted and the farmer will be but the serf and slave of or-

ganized interests of the world. I am not an alarmist, but I think I can foresee the dangers ahead for the farmers of the Nation, and into your hands I lay their claims and commit their destiny. The nine billions of the farmers' products should command for them the first consideration at the hands of Congress. When the farmer prospers the Nation prospers, and I warn Congress and the high officials of this Government that to persecute and oppress him means the greatest disaster in our history. [Applause.]

The farmer is alive to the great questions of the day. The political party which would deny the American farmer his rights or that would oppress him had as well prepare to go out of business. [Applause.]

The farmer should be the controlling factor in the business and political world, and I trust the day will soon come when he will realize his power and use it. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, one word in conclusion as to Kentucky.

The Kentucky farmer has led the way in the great work of organizing the farmers. We have opened the door of hope for the farmers of the Nation. By organization and cooperation we have worked wonders in the "Old Kentucky Home." Our legislatures have written laws that the farmers of every State should write into their statute laws. The cruel slanders heaped against Kentucky have been in many cases paid for by the gold of a trust in order that it might continue to fatten and feed upon our people. Life and property are as safe in Kentucky as in any State in the Union. The great trouble in my district is to keep the rich people of the East from buying up all of our fair land.

The fact that wealth comes seeking investment is the best indication of our peace and prosperity. The stranger within our gates, whether he seeks pleasure or business, is always welcome. We have our faults; no State and no people in this Union are without faults. Our citizenship is the peer of any, our lands as fair as any, our mines of coal can not be excelled. We invite all to come and see us and inspect our wonderful resources. All will be fairly treated and doubly welcomed.

IN KENTUCKY.

The moonlight falls the softest
In Kentucky;
The summer days come ofttest
In Kentucky;
Friendship is the strongest,
Love's light glows the longest,
Yet wrong is always wrongest
In Kentucky.

[Applause.]

Life's burdens bear the lightest
In Kentucky;
The home fires burn the brightest
In Kentucky;
While players are the keenest,
Cards come out the meanest,
The pocket empties cleanest
In Kentucky.

[Laughter and applause.]

The sun shines ever brightest
In Kentucky;
The breezes whisper lightest
In Kentucky;
Plain girls are the fewest,
Maidens' eyes the bluest,
Their little hearts are truest
In Kentucky.

[Loud applause.]

Orators are the grandest
In Kentucky;
Officials are the blandest
In Kentucky;
Boys are all the dillest,
Danger ever highest,
Ideals are the highest
In Kentucky.

The blue grass waves the bluest
In Kentucky;
Yet bluebloods are the fewest (?)
In Kentucky;
Moonshine is the clearest,
By no means the dearest,
And yet it acts the queerest
In Kentucky.

[Laughter.]

The dove notes are the saddest
In Kentucky;
The streams dance on the gladdest
In Kentucky;
Hip pockets are the thickest,
Pistol hands the slickest,
The cylinder turns quickest
In Kentucky.

[Laughter.]

The song birds are the sweetest
In Kentucky;
The thoroughbreds are fleetest
In Kentucky;
Mountains tower proudest,
Thunder peals the loudest,
The landscape is the grandest
And politics the damndest
In Kentucky.

J. H. MULLIGAN.

[Applause.]

I invite the American Congress to come to Kentucky and look us over—to meet the farmers and the people of Kentucky. Come down to Lexington trots this fall and get a sniff of the blue grass—and the mint.

Our people will be delighted to entertain you. Come to the home of Clay, Beck, and the Breckinridges—the old Ashland district, the best in all the world. The people of Kentucky will be proud to have you as their guests; their homes will be yours; their hearts will go out to you in love and good-fellowship. The "Old Kentucky Home" will be sung in its sweetest melody, and the people of Kentucky will join you, the Representatives of all the States, in a toast to "America," the grandest of all the nations in the history of the world. [Loud applause.]

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the gentleman from New York, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, having charge of the bill, that I now yield one minute to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, during the closing days of the special session the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] printed in the RECORD several newspaper and magazine articles in reference to the question of the rules of the House. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD as a part of my remarks some articles on the other side of the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing as indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NORRIS. The first article is one from La Follette's Magazine of January 8, 1910, as follows:

THE SECRET OF HIS POWER—A HISTORY OF THE INSURGENT MOVEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

[By GEORGE W. NORRIS, Representative, fifth district, Nebraska.]

When our forefathers framed the Constitution, that part of it nearest and dearest to the people was the part which provided for the House of Representatives. It was the only place in the national fabric where the people had a direct voice and vote. To-day, as far as the enactment of legislation is concerned, the House of Representatives bears about the same relation to the National Government as the appendix does to the human body—it has no well-recognized function. For all practical purposes our National Government, like Gaul of old, is divided into three parts—the Senate, the President, and the Speaker.

This perversion of the real intent and object of the Constitution has been brought about so gradually and quietly that until recently the people have not understood the method of its accomplishment. That the Speaker possesses a power second only to the President has been well understood by the people at large for several years. That by some mysterious power he controls the House of Representatives as with a rod of iron, and at will moves its Members like pawns about the political checkerboard of national legislation, is known of all men.

The existence of this authority was accepted by the country as a matter of fact, and many people believed that by some constitutional provision or some enactment of statute he had been given the power that he had been exercising. Members of the House of Representatives, who first stood off in amazement and wondered at the system of control, and then searched for the source of this power, soon discovered that the Constitution and the statutes enacted thereunder had given to the Speaker no authority whatever, but that all the power he possessed he obtained entirely and exclusively from the Rules of the House. Even in these rules it was not possible to find any specific enactment that gave to him, in direct terms, the wonderful authority over men and measures that he seemed to be in possession of. His control seemed to be absolute and almost without limit, and yet the specific authorization of his power was more or less a mystery and a secret.

REBELLIOUS MEMBERS PUNISHED.

From time to time Members have rebelled against the surrender of their individual rights and have denounced the arbitrary power of the Speaker upon the floor of the House. These outbursts occurred with peculiar regularity in nearly every Congress. They often showed the display of remarkable courage and ability in the individual Member, as single-handed and alone he denounced the most powerful machine connected with the management of our National Government. If the attack had been sufficiently severe and had attracted considerable attention from the country, the obstreperous Member was given an important committee assignment, which he had long been seeking, and thereby his murmurings were not only quieted, but he became a meek and lowly follower of the Iron Duke, while he enjoyed the political crumbs that were brushed to him from the Speaker's table. If, on the other hand, the rebellious Member could not be brought back into the reservation by the temptation of political pie, or the fear of political punishment, then he became a political outcast; a good committee assignment for him was impossible. In some mysterious way his people at home were given to understand that their Member had no influence, could not accomplish anything, and could not secure any legislation or other thing in which they were interested. In due time his political death was celebrated by the Speaker's machine, and the newcomers were pointed to the epitaph on his political tombstone as a warning against those who were so presumptuous as to attempt to change, or even complain of, the sacred and inspired rules.

And thus the Speaker's machine swept on, gathering to itself more and more power, becoming more and more arrogant, until by its very defiance of public opinion it brought upon itself the condemnation of the entire country. As the country at first recognized it, it saw only the head—the instrument—the man—the Speaker, without fully understanding that behind this individuality was the most powerful legislative machine that ever existed. The machine, it is true, consisted mainly of one man, but the wonderful power of his position enabled him to stifle legislation at his will and to bid defiance to the whole country. That the real source of his power was only partially understood added an uncertainty to the situation which threw about him and his position a mysterious fear that impressed the people with his acknowledged supremacy and their apparent helplessness.

WHERE UNION BRINGS STRENGTH.

In the House it had become evident that no relief could come; that the hair of this modern Samson could not be cut, except by organized effort. Every individual Member who had defied the Speaker's power had met with disaster and defeat. It was not until the short, or last session, of the Sixtieth Congress that a real organized effort was made to break the Speaker's power. At the beginning of that session, in December, 1908, there was a meeting of those Members who were in favor of curtailing the power of the Speaker. At this meeting a permanent organization was formed, a small legislature was organized. This body of men met regularly about three times a week during that entire session of Congress. Committees were appointed on all subjects connected with the investigations.

It is interesting to note the different opinions held by these Members as to the source of the Speaker's power. Some thought that a rule compelling the Speaker to accord recognition would bring about relief. Some were of the opinion that a method should be devised that would make it unnecessary for Members to go to the Speaker's private office and get his permission before asking unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill. Others believed that a rule setting aside one day in each week for the compulsory consideration of reported bills as they appeared on the calendar would be all that was necessary. Some others claimed that the only change necessary would be a rule that would make it in order after a committee had failed to report on any bill referred to it for a certain number of days to move to discharge the committee and consider the bill in the House. There were still others who argued that while all of these changes might be desirable and were important in themselves, yet none of them reached the vital spot. Recognition would be of but little value unless the Member recognized could, under the rules, make a motion that was in order. Unanimous consent would only relieve Members of the humiliation of privately asking the Speaker for what should be theirs by right, and was resorted to only as to such reported bills where there was no objection to their passage, and usually of a local nature. A calendar day, while very desirable, could, from its very nature only reach such bills as had been reported by a committee, whereas the influence of the Speaker was sufficient in many cases to prevent the committee from acting in many instances where the country was vitally interested. A rule that would provide for the taking away from the committee any bill, that after specified time had not been reported, would be difficult of enforcement, because the same influence that prevented the committee from acting would likewise be exerted upon the entire membership. The Speaker's influence was not confined to any one committee. Besides, this method of considering a bill by the entire House without any investigation by a committee would not be wise and would often result in poorly constructed statutes.

STRIKING AT THE HEART OF THE EVIL.

After months of earnest discussion, investigation, and deliberation, this body of men came to the conclusion that no change would be of any real or permanent value to the country that did not take from the Speaker the wonderful influences over the individual Members that his office gave him. It was well known that Members thought more of an important committee assignment than of anything connected with their official life. The Speaker, under existing rules, had the sole power of making such appointments, and by virtue thereof he controlled to a great extent the political destiny of every Member. By this authority he rewarded the faithful and punished those who refused to obey.

This, then, was the secret of the Speaker's power. It enabled him to influence the individual Member, to intimidate the committee, to control the House, to hold up the President, and to defy the country. The insurgents decided that whatever changes in the rules might be desirable, the one that should take away from the Speaker the authority to appoint the standing committees was vital and should be insisted upon.

The fight culminated on the 15th day of March, the first day of the special session, when the adoption of rules for the new House came up for consideration. How that fight was first won and then lost—how the Speaker's machine, in an attempt to adopt the old rules, went down to defeat, and then within a few minutes thereafter turned that defeat into victory by a combination with Tammany, by which the crumbling throne of the Iron Duke was saved from destruction, is still fresh in the minds of the readers and will not be repeated here.

CANNON'S ARROGANCE COSTLY TO HIMSELF.

At the very beginning of the insurgent movement an agreement was entered into that no attempt to fight the Speaker should be made and that the organization should not be used to defeat him for reelection. This agreement was absolutely necessary to secure any organization whatever. There were Members in the movement who announced at the very threshold of the organization that while they were in favor of taking away from the Speaker some of his extraordinary powers, they were, nevertheless, friendly to the present Speaker and should work and vote for his reelection.

This agreement was kept inviolate, and throughout the deliberations the speakership contest was absolutely excluded. The fight was made against the system and not against the individual. It is interesting, however, to note the change of sentiment that gradually took place in the insurgent camp. There was no logical reason why a Member should not be in favor of some change in the method of selecting the standing committees without incurring the personal animosity of the individual who happened at the time to hold the office of Speaker. However reasonable and sensible this view may be, those who held it were doomed to disappointment. It was soon found that the Speaker would not tolerate any attempt to decrease his power. An occasional disagreement from his idea of legislation was an offense that could be forgiven and condoned, but to even suggest that he should be deprived of the power to appoint the standing committees was an attempt to undermine his very throne, and anyone guilty of such a heinous crime must suffer political annihilation.

The insurgents, although perhaps not expressly told by the Speaker and his machine, were at least made to feel that they were political

outcasts. No consideration would be given to any Member who wanted to deprive the Speaker of some of his power. And thus a friendly contest, commenced in good faith to modify a simple rule of the House, had, by the Speaker's unreasonable and tyrannical course, been changed into a war of extermination. As the fight grew in intensity it increased in bitterness, and when the day of election came it is doubtful if there was a single insurgent who did not most devoutly hope that the Speaker might be defeated for reelection.

At a meeting called by the writer on the 15th of March of all insurgents who intended to vote for the reelection of the Speaker, but who would be willing to vote against him provided enough votes could be so pledged to bring about his defeat, there were present some Members who, at the beginning of the movement had openly declared themselves in favor of the nomination of the Speaker in the caucus and his reelection afterwards. These men had so changed their ideas on the speakership question that they had remained away from the Republican caucus and were ready to vote against the Speaker if enough votes could be pledged to defeat him. At this meeting there were present 7 Members. It would have taken 14. It was supposed at the time that it would require 15; that is, it was actually necessary to take away from the Speaker 14 votes and vote them for some other candidate. Inasmuch as it was found impossible to defeat him it was thought best not to undertake the proposed action.

INSURGENTS AIDED BY CANNON'S REVENGE.

What was the duty of the insurgents as to the speakership? Should they have voted against the reelection of the present Speaker? Some of them had openly pledged themselves to vote against him in the campaigns which they had recently made. They were bound, of course, to keep such promises. Some of them had attended the Republican caucus and were bound thereby to vote for him. There were still others who earnestly desired his defeat and were willing to vote against him if by so doing they could bring this about. They knew that the Speaker had sufficient power and influence to control the Republican caucus, and that the result of that caucus was definitely known in advance. They had therefore refused to go into caucus in order that they might be free to act should any possibility arise by which he could be defeated. As we have seen, his defeat was an impossibility. Hence, their votes, if cast against him, could not have had any effect upon the result, although there might have been much personal satisfaction in so voting.

As a matter of fact, these insurgents who voted for the reelection of the Speaker in so doing performed a real service to the cause for which they stood. It must be remembered that they were fighting for a change of the rule that gave the Speaker the power to appoint the standing committees of the House. They claimed that by this power he coerced the membership of the House to a great extent, on account of the fear of punishment which the rules gave him the authority to administer. Those who defended this authority of the Speaker, while admitting that the power to punish existed, claimed that no Speaker would ever be so unreasonable and unjust as to exercise it. The insurgents were morally certain from the fight made upon them by the Speaker that he would punish them by depriving them of all important committee appointments. This in fact is just what he did do when he made up the committee assignments. Had all the insurgents voted against him, he would have been able to have given some little plausibility as an excuse for this unjust act by claiming that the insurgents, in refusing to follow the action of the caucus, had placed themselves outside of the party, and were therefore entitled to no consideration. These men, by voting for him, even though they had not been in the caucus, made it impossible for even this excuse to be offered. Their action absolutely clinched the argument that by this great power the Speaker was enabled to punish those who refused to obey his mandates. It likewise completely refuted the claim made by his lieutenants that no Speaker would ever make such an unjust use of the power given to him by the rules. Under these circumstances this action of the Speaker in punishing the insurgents was in reality an actual illustration of the evil condemned by them and which they were fighting to eradicate. It shows what may be expected to happen when an ordinary man is clothed with extraordinary power. If this act is to remain uncondemned by the country, then the Speakers of the future, clothed with this extraordinary authority, will with a warning hand be able to point to the fate of the insurgents whenever a Member refuses to obey.

Some of the Speaker's closest friends regard this act as not only unjust, but, from their own standpoint of political expediency, as unwise; and yet it must be admitted even by his enemies that when he used the power of his official position to punish his fellow-Members for honestly following their conscientious convictions he was technically at least within the authority granted him by the rules. The country has condemned the man more than the rule. While the removal of the man from the office is very desirable, the change of the rule is absolutely necessary if we would retain any vestige of representative government in national affairs.

I will print next an article from the North American Review for May, 1910, by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK]:

THE INSURGENT MOVEMENT IN CONGRESS.

[By Hon. VICTOR MURDOCK, M. C., of Kansas.]

Those who have been designated popularly as "Rules insurgents" in Washington are moved to protest by a very simple provocation. They have never been strong numerically. They have never had more than the most temporary organization. They have never held out the hope of reward to recruits. Each Member of the band has suffered loss in committee preferment in the House of Representatives by reason of his attitude. They have been defeated frequently. Yet none of the discouragements they have met has dispersed the group.

Why does it hold together? Because the provocation which has led them into protest is fundamentally just, and every man in the movement recognizes that his cause is greater than he or his associates, and that the idea which has claimed him as its follower will, if need be, march on without him or his fellows; indeed, without a following at all. Coupled with this belief is the conviction that the march of the idea must end in ultimate triumph, victory, coming immediately public opinion is fully informed.

If the protest of these so-called insurgents were a struggle of those who have not against those who have, it could not display this vitality. If it were a contest of those who are out against those who are in, its dissolution would have taken place long ago. It is neither the one nor the other.

It is, on the contrary, a struggle of a group, not against another and larger group, not against a faction or a man, but against a perverted legislative system. The system under attack is not wholly peculiar to the Federal Congress. It is known in small degree to ward caucuses,

town meetings, state conventions, state legislatures, conclaves of fraternal societies, and assemblies of other organizations having parliamentary procedure. But the perversion of the system has reached its climax in the House of Representatives. There its oppression is heaviest and there it was the most natural thing in the world it should meet its first serious challenge.

The system under attack has the evil portion of its life in the successful denial of vital participation on the part of the majority in constructive legislation. It has perverted the instrumentality of cloture, originally intended to expedite the business of a congregation of men, into a method for preventing the majority from recording its desire. For cloture in the House of Representatives has ceased to be used merely for bringing a question to a concluding and deciding vote; its greater office has been to force the majority not merely to conclude the consideration of the question by a vote, but to fashion and determine the very nature of the question itself by that vote. There is a mighty difference.

To give a concrete instance: The recent tariff bill was reported out of the committee into the House. Cloture was applied for one purpose generally understood and indorsed, that is to expedite the measure and force its consideration with dispatch to a concluding and deciding vote. But cloture was applied for another and far more weighty purpose not generally understood, to make the tariff bill what those who dominated the committee which reported it wanted it to be and to prevent the majority of the House from making the bill what the majority wanted it to be. The committee which framed the bill had access to every item of the thousands in the tariff measure. The committee could change any one of the items or all of them. The House itself under cloture could change but five items in the bill—barley, barley malt, lumber, hides, and petroleum.

Now, as possession is nine points in law, initiation is nine points in legislation. The man who frames a measure has a great advantage over those who would amend it. This advantage becomes complete when, through cloture, all right to amend the measure is denied. The deciding congregation of men are then asked to vote up the proposal as a whole or reject it. It can not be known to the great body of American electors that most of their major legislation is passed through the House of Representatives in this way. It may be well to cite another instance. The Aldrich emergency currency law had its origin in a currency famine in October, 1907. Congress assembled in the following December. The pressure of public opinion upon Congressmen was general in the form of a popular insistence that provision be made for an emergency currency to be used in similar crises. The Aldrich idea was broached. The expression of the Members of the House was overwhelmingly against the Aldrich idea. Thereupon another idea, the Vreeland plan, was born. It was acceptable to the House, which passed the Vreeland bill and sent it to the Senate. In the Senate the Aldrich idea was attached in its entirety to the Vreeland bill, and both plans came back as a single bill from the Senate. The session was drawing to a close. Notwithstanding popular demand, Congress had passed no law meeting the necessity of emergency currency. Cloture was applied, the right to amend the Vreeland-Aldrich bill shut off, and Congressmen were told to accept the Aldrich idea, which they did not indorse, or return to their people without any response whatever to their demands. Congressmen accepted the Aldrich idea, under duress, and passed the bill.

Now, those who are called insurgents are not against cloture. They are for the dispatch of business, and in a large body of men debate upon occasions must be limited. But they do not indorse cloture when it is used, not to expedite public business, but to exclude the majority from vital participation in the construction of major legislation. Their exclusion from such participation is at the bottom of their attack upon the system. Their impeachment of the system arises because the right of representation, in the sense of vital participation in constructive legislation, has been monopolized by a few men and finally lodged in its entirety in the person and office of the Speaker.

If I can, I would like to convey to the man who has had no congressional experience the extent to which this transfer of power from the House itself to the person and office of one man has gone. The right to representation in the House is not wholly an affair of the individual Congressman. It is primarily a right that belongs to the 200,000 people in his district. Whatever his personal feelings in the matter he ought to have a keen regard for the function of representation as it is related to the people who have delegated him to act for them. Many Representatives do. The great majority of men who come to Congress bring with them an abiding faith in the good sense and justness of the people. They have come to know the mass of electors as individuals who are hearty in their commendations and slow in their condemnations of public servants, and of infinite patience in public affairs. Faith in the people is a cardinal tenet of Representatives newly come to Congress.

But the new Representative finds, after the blindness of his first confusion, that the 200,000 people who have sent him as a Representative are to have no vital participation in the construction of major legislation through any exercise of his representative functions. He may voice his sentiments endlessly; he may vote "aye" or "no" on a proposition of importance. But he can not amend it to his own liking; he can not even offer those about him the opportunity to vote up or down the change he would propose. His next step is one of humiliation. He may personally petition those who have the privilege of amending the proposition within the secret committee which is constructing the bill. But when he takes this step, it is with the thought that the constituents who sent him to Congress delegated him as a Representative and not as a petitioner. If he swallows his humiliation and becomes personally a suppliant before a committee, he finds at last that the power of initiation, the power that is nine points in legislation, is not in the committee, but in that part of the system which creates the personnel of the committee—the Speaker of the House.

If he does not succumb to the system at this point and surrender his desire to go further into the mysteries through which popular representation has been distorted into an autocracy, he will continue his investigation, and the next step involves analysis. Granted the speaker-ship has taken to itself the power of the individual membership of the House, how is it lodged and how exercised? The power which has been shifted from the House to its presiding officer becomes in the Speaker twofold in character—it is personal and official. This circumstance gave origin to the phrase, "The Speaker exercises his power personally in selecting them to poor committees; by making up committees of men who agree with him on certain phases of important pending

public measures; by placing upon measures which are to be pushed through under cloture the imprint of his personal idea; by extending recognition on suspension day to those he desires to favor. He exercises his official power by his control over business. He may permit consideration of a measure or prevent its consideration. This he does under the rules, and in particular under three rules, one of which bestows upon him the chairmanship of a very small but most important committee called the Committee on Rules, another which gives him the right of arbitrary recognition, and another which permits him to name not only the standing committees, but to designate the chairman of each committee. No one could differentiate distinctly between the use of the Speaker's personal power and his official power in all transactions. Ordinarily the Speaker uses both, and a diminution in either of his powers perceptibly weakens him in both.

The service of the Speaker on the Committee on Rules is important to the office in this: The committee has as its chief function the right to apply cloture, to put through the House a concrete measure without permitting the House to amend it. The Speaker dominates the committee. He decides upon the form of the measure and is its chief advocate. And then when it is put before the House, he mounts to the Speaker's chair as judge of the court before which the trial of his own measure is to proceed.

The power of the Speaker in recognition, when it is fully understood by the public, must be astounding. Every man who has served as a delegate in a ward caucus, fraternal society convention, conference, or other conclave knows that there is an arbitrary element in the presiding officer's power of recognition that may not be eliminated and which is often used selfishly and to further some concerted and often secret prearrangement. If two men in a meeting rise simultaneously, a presiding officer must name arbitrarily the man who is to speak first. There is no help for this, and a great many people think that this is the complaint against the Speaker by those called insurgents. But this is not the complaint. Under the rules, and the voluminous precedents which have grown up under them, the Speaker may refuse to entertain a motion by a Member when the Member has no competitor for recognition and when the Member asking recognition is in order. The formula in use on these occasions, and they occur on days when it is in order to suspend the rules, is the ultimatum by the Speaker, after he has heard the motion of the Member seeking recognition: "The gentleman is not recognized for that purpose."

The power of the Speaker in naming committees is that which accrues to any form of close military organization. The Speaker is the general of the House and the chairman of committees are his field marshals. Control runs not upward from the Members to the Speaker through the chairmen of committees. It runs downward from the Speaker through the chairmen to the Members. There have been many occasions when the magic words, "The Speaker wants this measure passed," passing electrically through the House, saved the day for a bill, as, conversely, there is one known instance when a majority of Congress petitioned a Speaker to permit consideration of a bill and were denied.

Now, those who are called insurgents desire (1) to make the Speaker ineligible to a place on the Committee on Rules; (2) to take away the power of the Speaker to refuse recognition when recognition is in order and there is no rival for the floor when a Member asks it; (3) to have the House itself select its own standing committees. There is no effort by the insurgents, and there has been none, to do away with any of the procedure which makes for expedition in public business. The power of closing debate is not to be touched. The Reed rules against dilatory motions and for counting a quorum are to be left undisturbed. The means to overcome a filibuster and proceed to a final vote on all measures will stand in all its efficacy.

It is proposed that the Speaker shall surrender his monopoly in legislative initiation; that he shall give up a control that cuts the convictions of Representatives to fit the irregularities of his personal caprices; that he shall lose his power, be it personal, official, or both, which enables him to block and delay public business through the device of the pigeonhole, refusal of consideration and the postponement of mandatory bills. But most of all, it is proposed to give back to the membership of the House the right of vital participation in legislation, the privilege of reflecting, not the wish of the presiding officer, but the wish of their constituencies.

So often attacks upon existing systems which have the prestige of long existence are fanciful that I would again repeat: It is not proposed by those called insurgents to run the House without rules; it is no part of their plan to do away with the previous question which stops debate when a majority so wills; it is not intended to abolish the Committee on Rules, which can compel immediate action upon concrete propositions; it is no part of the changes proposed in the rules that the Speaker shall be compelled to recognize a Member when the Member is not in order in asking recognition; it is no part of the correction sought by the insurgents that a way shall be opened for the minority to obstruct and delay public business; it is not asked that the Reed rules, which prevented filibusters, be relegated; it is not designed by anyone that any changes shall give the individual Member such power as would enable him to block or embarrass orderly procedure.

There is no attack upon the procedure for the dispatch of business. The attack is upon that part of the system which denies vital participation in constructive legislation by the membership of the House. The attack has one purpose in view, and one purpose only—to make the House of Representatives what it was designed in the Constitution it should be, what it must be if it is to be responsive to the genius of this Democracy and in harmony with the spirit of progress of this people, representative not only in name, but representative also in fact.

I will also print an article dealing with the system of control built up under the rules of the House by which the power of the machine to control legislation is shown and illustrated:

CANNONISM: WHAT IT IS.

[By GEORGE W. NORRIS, Member of Congress from Nebraska.]

A teacher in the public schools of the city of Washington, in teaching analysis to her grammar class, wrote on the blackboard the following sentence: "The Speaker rules the House." A small boy in the rear seat raised his hand and, when permitted by the teacher to speak, said, "The sentence is not true. It ought to be 'The Speaker rules the country.'"

In one of our large cities a would-be citizen was being examined as to his qualifications for citizenship. He was asked the question, "What office in the United States is the most influential and powerful?" Without hesitation he answered, "The office of Speaker of the House of Representatives." The judge, who was a student of present-day

conditions, at once ruled that the answer showed that the applicant possessed the necessary qualifications to become a citizen of our great country.

When Congress convened on the first day of the present session, the proceedings in the House were opened with prayer by the Chaplain. It is customary at such times to pray for the officials of our Government, beginning with the President, as the one highest in authority. On this occasion the rules of the past were made to conform to the realities of the present, and the old, blind Chaplain, who, although he can not read, is nevertheless posted on present political conditions, after indulging in some generalities, prayed first for the Speaker, and then for the President, and so on down the list.

All classes of our people, both native and foreign born, from the judge to the layman, from the minister in the pulpit to the citizen, from the teacher to the child, realize and understand that, in some undefined and mysterious way, the Speaker of the House is a power in our National Government, around which everything else seems to revolve. This conception is not only correct, but it is not exaggerated.

AMERICA'S GREATEST QUESTION.

The question involved in the power of the Speaker of the House of Representatives is by far the greatest question before the American people to-day. It is interesting to trace the source of this power. It is conceded by all that the Speaker has a power second only to that of the President, and there are instances where his influence in preventing the passage of legislation is even greater than that of the President.

Our forefathers, when they adopted the Constitution, undoubtedly intended that the House of Representatives should be nearer the people than any other branch of our National Government. In that great instrument the functions of the National Government were divided into three distinct departments—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—and they were named therein in the order herein mentioned.

The legislative powers that are described in the Constitution are vested in a Senate and a House of Representatives. The duties, the rights, and the jurisdiction of the House of Representatives are the first defined in that great instrument. It is the only part of our National Government connected directly with the people. The Members of the House of Representatives are the only ones who are elected by the people. Their term of office is short, in order that they may respond to the sentiment of the country. They are elected directly by the people from districts, in order that every portion of the country may be therein represented. It is important, therefore, that the functions and powers of the House of Representatives should be retained and not delegated to any individual or set of individuals. Just as soon as the House of Representatives delegates its powers, its jurisdiction, and its functions cease to be a really representative body, and the people of the country lose the representation that the founders of the Constitution intended they should have. The only place in the Constitution where the Speaker of the House of Representatives is mentioned is where it states that the House of Representatives shall elect its Speaker. Nowhere in that document is there any power delegated to the Speaker or any authority whatever given to him.

WHENCE COMES THE SPEAKER'S POWER?

If we search the statutes of our national legislature and examine all the laws passed by Congress, we will look in vain for any authority given to the Speaker by general law. There are instances wherein, by a law of Congress, he has been empowered to appoint members of commissions, etc., but nowhere is he given any authority whatever looking to the control or management of the work or the deliberations of the House. It is evident, therefore, that whatever power the Speaker possesses he obtains somewhere outside of the Constitution and outside of the laws passed by Congress.

The authority and great power of the Speaker is derived entirely from the rules of the House of Representatives. These rules for the government of the House are adopted at the beginning of every Congress (not session) and are effective and in force only during the life of the House that adopted them. The rules of the House do not have to be passed by the Senate or approved by the President. They become effective upon the action of the House alone. It is important to note that all the power of the Speaker, making him the second official in our National Government in influence and authority, is not derived either from the Constitution or any general law of the country, but comes entirely and exclusively from the authority given him by the rules of the House of Representatives. This authority has been gradually increased and has been exercised in an increasing degree for a great many years. The change to greater influence and power, however, has been so gradual that the people of the United States, and even the Members of the House of Representatives, have scarcely noticed it, and while every man, woman, and child in the country understands, in a general way, just what power the Speaker has, they have not given sufficient consideration to the subject to realize that none of this power comes either from the Constitution or any law of the country.

A CASE IN POINT.

The power of the Speaker as it really exists and as understood by the country at large is illustrated by what happened in the country immediately after our last national election. In that election the Republican party had pledged in its platform that if its candidate for President was elected and a majority of the House of Representatives were also elected (it having already control of the Senate) it would revise the tariff.

It is now in the recollection of all that immediately after the election, when it was known the Republicans had been successful in retaining the control of both branches of Congress and had elected their candidate for President, that there was, from one end of the country to the other, a great deal of doubt expressed by people in all walks of life and by practically all the newspapers of the country as to whether the tariff would really be revised.

There was no suspicion on the part of the people that the President elected was not in favor of such revision, or that he would not do all he could to bring it about. Neither was there any fear that the House of Representatives, elected likewise on that platform, had any other idea than to do their duty in revising the tariff in accordance with their pledge.

It was known, however, that the Speaker of the House, in the language of the day, was "standpatter." At heart he was opposed to the revision of the tariff. The newspapers for several days after election were full of queries and arguments pro and con as to whether the Speaker would permit a revision to take place.

In looking at it in a sober, unbiased light, it seems almost incredible that after the country had expressly approved the revision plank there should be any doubt as to the pledge being carried out, when

that doubt was caused entirely by the election of 1 Congressman, out of 391, from a district in Illinois who was opposed to the redemption of the pledge. And yet there was very little question in the minds of the people but what this one man could prevent such revision if he so desired. No one questioned his ability to do so, and no one seemed to inquire the source of his authority or why such an abnormal condition could possibly exist in our country.

A few days after the election, at a banquet held in the city of Chicago, the Speaker made a speech in which he stated in substance that since the country had expressed itself so emphatically in favor of revision, he was in favor of carrying out the pledge. In effect, he stated to the country that he would permit the President and Congress to revise the tariff in accordance with the platform. Practically every newspaper in the United States printed the substance of that speech in its next issue, and the country heaved a sigh of relief in gratification of the Speaker's announced permission to permit Congress and the President to carry out the pledge.

SPEAKER HOLDS THE KEY.

This power was further illustrated by another incident that happened during the first session of the Sixtieth Congress. While Congress was in session in Washington there was held in the city of Baltimore, a short distance away, the national convention of the ministers of the Methodist Church. A certain bill was pending before the Judiciary Committee of the House, in which the temperance people of the United States were vitally interested. These ministers in session at Baltimore appointed a committee of their members to proceed to Washington and interview the Speaker with a view of urging the passage of this legislation.

It is important to note that it was conceded by all and taken for granted by everybody that the Speaker held the key to the situation.

The bill was pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. The committee made no effort to have a hearing before this committee or to make any argument there in favor of its passage. It made no attempt to influence the different Members of the House. It proceeded at once to interview the Speaker. It is worthy of note, too, that when they called on the Speaker he did not intimate to his committee of ministers that they ought to go before the Committee on the Judiciary, or that they ought to take it up with the different Members of the House, but he practically told them in a very curt, if not disrespectful, way that the bill could not pass.

After their rebuke by the Speaker, the ministers began a campaign against what they termed "Cannonism," and what they believed to be the person of the Speaker himself.

It is to be regretted that this great body of men did not look deeper into the cause of the difficulty. They seemed to be of the opinion, and in this the entire country shared, that the defeat of the individual who happened to be the Speaker would bring about the desired change.

However desirable it might have been to prevent the reelection of the Speaker of the House, or to prevent his reelection as Speaker after he had been elected as a Member, it is quite apparent that the real danger, the real evil, and the real difficulty was way beyond and beneath the personality of any man. The real remedy lay in the taking away either from the present Speaker, or any other Speaker who might be elected in his place, the great and unnatural power that gave to him the right to thwart the will not only of Congress, but of the entire country.

SPEAKER'S TRICKERY THWARTS PEOPLE'S WILL.

The wonderful power of the Speaker to prevent legislation demanded not only by the country, but by Congress as well, was well illustrated during the first session of the Sixtieth Congress, when he, almost alone and single-handed, prevented the enactment of the national law providing for the publicity of campaign contributions. Practically all the people and the entire press of the country were advocating the enactment of this kind of law. President Roosevelt in most strenuous language urged Congress to pass a law upon this subject. Mr. Taft, who it was known at that time would be nominee for President on behalf of the Republican party, wrote a letter for publication earnestly requesting Congress to take action. Mr. Bryan, the acknowledged leader of the Democratic party, also took a position before the country in favor of such a law. Four-fifths—yes, nine-tenths of the Members of Congress were in favor of taking the proper action on the subject.

The committee having in charge bills upon this subject gave extended hearings, and finally unanimously agreed upon the bill and reported the same to the House with the recommendation that it pass. It was known that the Speaker was opposed to this legislation. The action of the committee would undoubtedly have been taken at an earlier date had it not been for this opposition. In this particular case, however, the Speaker finally lost control of the committee, and notwithstanding his opposition the pressure on the committee from the press, from Congress, and from the leaders of both political parties was so great that the bill was reported to the House. The session was drawing to a close. If the law was to be of any effect in the national campaign then coming on, it must be enacted before the adjournment of the session. Republicans and Democrats likewise were anxious to secure the passage of the bill. There was nothing whatever in the way except the opposition of the Speaker. Practically the entire country was behind the bill, and the Speaker alone stood opposed to it.

We shall see how, even in this condition, the Speaker, by virtue of the wonderful power he possessed, was successful in thwarting the will of the entire country and preventing the passage of the bill.

All it required for its passage was that the Speaker should recognize the Member having charge of the bill to move to suspend the rules and pass it. He was importuned by members of the committee and also Members of the House to give this recognition. Under the rules of the House this motion could not have consumed more than forty minutes of time. Practically a unanimous membership was ready to vote for it. It was known that the Senate was ready to pass it and the President anxious to sign it. The pressure upon the Speaker became so great that he could not well defy its demands longer. He must either yield and permit the bill to become a law or he must resort to some trick of parliamentary procedure by which he could prevent it.

In this dilemma he had another Member of the House, who was not a member of the committee that reported the bill, introduce as a new bill the identical bill reported by the committee, with the amendment added thereto providing for the reenactment of some of the old election laws of reconstruction days.

When this new bill was introduced the Speaker referred it to the Committee on the Census. The referring of such a bill to the Committee on the Census on its face appears to be rather a suspicious circumstance, but it was only one step, and an unimportant one, too, in the proceeding by which the Speaker determined to perform this parliamentary trick. It was known that the addition of the amendment

providing for the reenactment of the reconstruction election laws would meet with strenuous opposition from the Democrats, and that in the Senate it would absolutely prevent the passage of the bill within the few days left of the pending session. In carrying out his scheme he recognized the Member who had introduced the bill to make the motion to suspend the rules and pass it in its entirety. Under this rule there was no provision for amendment and no possibility of making any change in the bill.

The bill passed the House and died in the Senate, as everybody knew it would, but the Speaker and his machine were able to turn to the country and say, "We have passed a bill providing for publicity of campaign contributions in national elections, but on account of opposition in the Senate it did not become a law."

While I believe the Speaker was wrong in his position in these illustrations, yet the illustrations are not given for the purpose of showing that on these particular questions he was not in accord with the sentiment of the country or of Congress, but, rather, that by virtue of his great authority he was able to prevent, if he so desired, the carrying out of the will of the people. In principle it would have been just the same had he used his power in the opposite direction.

"Cannonism," in its reality, goes beyond any personality. It is in reality the power and not the man; the machine and not the individual. The Speaker in his personality is only the head, the instrument, by which the power given by the rules of the House is carried out and exercised.

THE KEYSTONE OF THE CANNONISM ARCH.

The particular rule of the House of Representatives by virtue of which the Speaker is given this immense control of national legislation is that rule which gives him authority to appoint all the standing committees of the House of Representatives.

In a body as large as the House it is quite apparent to all that most of the real work is and must be done by the great committees. This comes as a natural necessity from the size of the body, and it will be conceded by everybody that in order to make any headway in legislation the House must necessarily appoint committees upon various subjects, to whom must be referred all proposed legislation pertaining to those particular subjects.

Every man who is elected to Congress makes a strenuous effort at the very beginning of his official career to get on some particular committee of his individual liking. If his portion of the country is particularly interested in agriculture, for instance, and he has made a study of the subject until he is well versed and posted upon it, he naturally desires to be put upon the Committee on Agriculture. If he has made a study of the questions of navigation and the rivers and harbors of our country, and comes from a section of the country where its commerce perhaps depends upon the improvement of a river or a harbor, he is extremely anxious to be put upon the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. For the same reason other Members desire to be put on other committees having control of the particular line of legislation in which the Member and his people are directly interested.

The Member knows that if he is able to obtain appointment on his much-desired committee, he will be thus enabled to assist in framing the legislation of the Government along those lines. He will be able to obtain the necessary and desired legislation in which his portion of the country has a direct interest. To him it means a continuance of his political life. He is imbued with an honest and patriotic desire to accomplish something along some particular line. He wants to do as much good for his section of the country as he possibly can. He is likewise desirous of reelection and of remaining at least for a few terms in Congress. The denial of his request would be the greatest blow that could be struck at his honorable and patriotic ambition.

He learns, when he goes to Congress, that every road asking for favor leads to the private office of the Speaker. He finds that there is no way to get the coveted place unless he can gain the favor of the Speaker. If he be successful in securing his desired position, he very naturally feels very friendly and under great obligation to the man who gave him the place and by whose favor he is thus enabled to satisfy his budding and not unpatriotic ambition. It is natural that he should improve every opportunity to favor any reasonable proposition or plan of the Speaker, in order to partially repay and return the favor he has received at his hands.

No one Member is able to master all of the details of the legislation that comes before Congress. On those things upon which he had made a personal investigation, or upon which he had settled and undisputed convictions, he would follow his own ideas, but upon questions where he had not made an investigation and upon which he had had no opportunity fully to post himself, he would be inclined to vote as he found the Speaker wanted him to vote, even though his conscience might be inclined to lead him in the opposite direction. He would weigh every doubt in favor of the Speaker. He would soon find, too, that the Speaker was the head of quite a machine in the House, consisting of men, usually chairmen of important committees, who had received all their favors at the Speaker's hands, and that this machine or combination made itself very active in the handling of the various bills that came before Congress.

"FOLLOW THE LEADER!"

He would learn before long that a refusal to follow the leadership of this recognized and Speaker-selected combination would bring down upon his head the censure and displeasure of the Speaker and his chosen lieutenants.

He would find, too, that men who had preceded him in Congress and had exercised their constitutional right of refusing to follow this leadership had been punished in various ways. They had not been able to secure committee appointments, or they had been refused permission to name any of the appointees of the House, and had been in various ways made to feel the iron hand of this machine in the severest kind of punishment.

If he looked up the records, he would find that men who had refused to follow this leadership were unable to obtain results satisfactory to their constituents, and that in the end the political life had been crushed out of them and their white bones were shining in the sun in the political bone yard.

He found when matters of legislation came up before his committee that the first inquiry usually made there when it was taken up for consideration, was as to what attitude, if any, the Speaker had taken on the subject, and he soon realized that those above him on the committee were extremely anxious in all cases to know what the Speaker thought about any proposed legislation before it was given any active consideration by the committee.

From the rules, he learned that the Speaker had the power at the beginning of each Congress when these committees were appointed, to cut off the political heads of those who had shown any independence or any disposition to refuse to follow his leadership.

The result of it all usually was that like those who had preceded him, he followed the lines of least resistance. He permitted the Speaker and his machine to map out and mark out his course, and little by little gave up his own individuality and his own identity and became himself a part of the great machine, dealing out to his constituents the political pie as it was given him by those in higher authority over the political pie counter.

CANNONISM: WHAT IT IS.

[By GEORGE W. NORRIS, Member of Congress from Nebraska.]

"Have you seen the Speaker?" "Can you get recognition?" "Will the Speaker consent?" These are common expressions between Members of the House of Representatives when talking to each other in regard to particular bills which they are anxious to have enacted into law.

At the very first meeting of one of the important committees of the House, to which a new Member had been assigned, he was astounded to hear one of the older members of the committee inquire of the chairman if he had seen the Speaker in regard to a particular bill that was then under discussion. He was still more astounded when, at that meeting, a motion was actually made and passed instructing the chairman to have a conference with the Speaker and to ascertain whether he would permit the passage of the bill in question.

The new member was surprised that it would be necessary to take such a course, but he was more surprised that the old members of the committee, who had served in Congress for many years, seemed to look upon this procedure as a common one—to take it as a matter of course that the Speaker's consent was absolutely necessary, and that the legislation desired could not be had without such consent.

The Speaker by virtue of this power, to a great extent, holds the political life, the political hope, and the political salvation of every Member in the palm of his hand. At the beginning of any Congress he has it within his power to cut off the political head of any Member, by depriving him of appointment to his favorite committee.

CLOUDING THE ISSUE.

Those who defend the rules that give to the Speaker this great power, always seek to avoid the real point at issue. They invariably make a defense in some particular where they have not been attacked.

Even the Speaker himself, in a magazine article printed recently, made an elaborate defense of the rules along this line. He goes on to tell that there are 391 Members of the House; that in the last Congress there were introduced 39,000 bills in the House; and then he makes a computation to show how much time it would take if each of these 391 Members used one minute in making a speech on each one of these 39,000 bills. Of course, it does not require much of a mathematician to see that at this rate the House would never be able to accomplish anything. The impression that the Speaker desires to convey is that if these people who are trying to secure a change of the rules, known ordinarily as "insurgents," were successful, that the House of Representatives would become an unmanageable body without any control whatever, from any source, and that thereafter no business could be transacted.

This method of argument by the Speaker only shows how unfair and unjust the defenders of the Speaker's machine are.

The real facts are that no one has attacked the rules in this particular. No one has asked for any change in this regard. Everybody admits that in a body as large as the House of Representatives there must be means, sometimes severe perhaps, by which debate can be controlled and discussion abruptly closed. In all the fight the insurgents have made against the rules, they have never once, in any respect whatever, made any claim that they desired to amend the rule which the Speaker has labored so hard to defend.

The Speaker then goes on to defend Tom Reed and the change in the rules he brought about. Speaker Reed insisted on counting a quorum when a quorum was present. It had been the custom prior to this ruling, for a Member to remain silent in his seat when the roll was called and the record would then show he was absent. In this way the minority were frequently able to have the records show that no quorum was present, when as a matter of fact many more than a quorum were actually there in their seats. Speaker Reed decided that when a man was in his seat the records should show that he was present even though he did not answer to his name. In this way, if a quorum were actually present, the records would show the fact, although the Members might refuse to answer to their names. This ruling of Speaker Reed has been followed ever since, both by Democratic and Republican administrations of the House. The Speaker labors at considerable length to defend Speaker Reed in making this ruling. No Member of the House on either side claims that the ruling was wrong. Everybody, as a matter of fact, admits that it was right and there is no disposition whatever to make any change in the rules in this respect. In the fight which the insurgents have made no reference whatever has been made to this particular rule, and at no time have any of the insurgents ever demanded a change of the rule. They not only have not opposed this rule, but, without exception, defend it.

The Speaker thus wastes a great portion of his time in defending the rules where there has been absolutely no sign of any attack and where there has been absolutely no complaint whatever. If this course were pursued by an ordinary lawyer in the trial of a lawsuit before a country justice, he would be condemned by the entire community as a pettifogger.

THE REAL ISSUE.

The insurgents who have been fighting for a change of the rules put their demand in writing and introduced it as a resolution. If it were summed up and put in one sentence, it could be expressed in a demand that the rule empowering the Speaker to select the standing committees of the House be changed so as to deprive the Speaker of that power. This one change would at any time have settled the fight over the rules, had the machine been willing to concede it.

At the beginning of the special session of the Sixty-first Congress, when the fight took place between the insurgents, on the one hand, and the Speaker's machine, on the other, over the adoption of the rules for that Congress, it was discovered that entrenched behind the rules of the House were all the special interests and combinations which have occasion at any time to ask legislative favors at the hands of Congress.

The fight made by the insurgents had been so fierce and they were organized so well that when the vote was taken on the adoption of the rules of the Sixtieth Congress for the Sixty-first Congress the motion was defeated.

For the first time in the history of the country the machine of the Speaker had gone down to defeat. There had never been an instance before, when the House had been organized at the beginning of Con-

gress, whether it was Republican or Democratic rule, when the Speaker's machine had been defeated in the adoption of its rules. This victory, won by the insurgents, while important and of itself a great moral success, was, nevertheless, of short duration. The insurgents had counted on the support of the Democrats. They had a right to expect this, because in the last Democratic national convention, held at Denver, that party had pledged itself to the country that it would revise the rules of the House and take away this abnormal power of the Speaker, if given the opportunity.

CANNON SAVED BY DEMOCRATS.

It was found, however, that entrenched behind the rules of the House were Democrats as well as Republicans. The Speaker's lieutenants charged the insurgents with being Democrats during the fight on the adoption of the rules, but the link was hardly dry wherein the charge was written down before the Speaker and his entire machine were not only found in combination with Democrats, but also following in the lead of Democrats, in their combined efforts to save the power of the Speaker's machine.

As soon as this motion to adopt the old rules had failed, the Speaker recognized a Democratic Member, who moved to adopt the old rules, with a slight amendment of minor importance. He merely added an amendment to the motion which had just failed, in order to make it in order as a parliamentary proposition. This was practically the same motion, made now by a Democrat instead of a Republican, and followed the other motion within a few minutes.

When the roll was called on this motion, it was found that the victory so recently won had been taken away by a combination of the Speaker's machine and Democrats.

It is interesting to note the class of Democrats who voted for this motion. Every Tammany Member except one voted for it. It became evident then that this great Democratic organization of the city of New York was vitally interested in having the Speaker retain the power vested in him by the rules.

For the first time it was then disclosed that Tammany, the greatest of all Democratic machines, and the Speaker, the head of the greatest of all Republican machines, had a common ground upon which to stand, and this ground was behind the intrenchments of the House rules.

Tammany, a Democratic organization, would under no circumstances come over to the Republican side of the House to help a Republican machine retain its power, unless the Republican machine had either already in some way paid for this cooperation or had made a definite promise to pay for it in the future. No one of intelligence ever thought for a moment that Tammany would come to the relief of the Speaker and his machine at this critical moment unless there was something in it for Tammany. Somewhere, sometime, in some way it must receive its pay for this unholy alliance.

"FOR VALUE RECEIVED."

It would be interesting also to note the reward received by these Democrats at the hands of the Speaker when he appointed the standing committees of the House.

It would likewise be illuminating, if space permitted, to trace the history of some of the items that were later put in the tariff bill, and to show the circumstances connecting them with this fight over the adoption of the rules.

An entire chapter might be written in this connection regarding the method by which the countervailing duty on petroleum was put in that bill after the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee had unanimously decided that petroleum should go on the free list.

When the true history of this part of the recent tariff bill is written, the American people will be surprised to discover that the Speaker's power was sufficient to put this product of the Standard Oil Company in the protected list, even though all the members of the Ways and Means Committee were opposed to it. It is true that as the bill finally became a law, petroleum was left on the free list, but this change was made afterwards and met with the determined opposition of the Speaker.

CANNON THROWS SOME BOOMERANGS.

In the defense of the rules made by the Speaker in the magazine article referred to, he tells us of a New York publisher who had fought the House rules, and then in the face of such defiance of the Speaker's authority, had the audacity to send his confidential agent to him asking for an appropriation of \$50,000 from the Federal Treasury for his "own pet project."

In the same article he tells us of another publisher who came direct to the Speaker's room in person with the proposition that he would turn over to the Speaker the entire press of the country if the Speaker would enact for him one particular piece of legislation.

In several recent public speeches made by the Speaker, he tells the country that one of the great newspaper publishers promised to give to him the support of all the newspapers of the country, in his candidacy for the Presidency, if the Speaker would push through Congress the particular legislation which this publisher desired.

The Speaker has given these illustrations in making his defense of the House rules. As a matter of fact, if they all be true, they furnish the best of reasons why the power given the Speaker by the rules should be taken away. The men who made these propositions to the Speaker were neither fools nor idiots. They were leaders, according to the Speaker's own story, of the particular branches of business in which they were engaged.

The question might well be asked: Why did they go to the Speaker? If the Speaker did not possess this wonderful power, why would the wise men of the country hound him in his private office, praying that he bring about the enactment of the particular laws in which they were interested?

Assuming CANNON's statement to be true, it is quite evident that they believed the Speaker possessed the power which they have ascribed to him. The Speaker in his denunciation of the men, does not even deny that he could have brought about the exact legislation which they demanded.

This power, which the Speaker himself has practically admitted that he possesses, is too great and too far-reaching to be in the possession of any one man, regardless of his ability, his patriotism, or his wisdom. It is against this power that the insurgents have been, and are, making their fight. It is to retain this power that the Speaker and his machine have been in desperation driven into a combination, the results of which have affected, and will in the future affect, all the important legislation of Congress.

CANNON SETS UP "STRAW MEN."

In this same magazine article the Speaker does an injustice to the insurgents when he, in effect, claims that the insurgents of the House were asking that the committees of the House be appointed in the same manner that the committees of the Senate are appointed. The truth is

that the insurgents have never made any such demand, and this claim by the Speaker is not only unjust, but also unwarranted by the facts.

SPEAKER MAY REWARD OR DESTROY.

Convicts laboring within the walls of a prison know that there is but a solitary guard standing between them and the freedom of the outer world. A rush for freedom would perhaps mean that many of them would escape, but they know that this guard is armed with a repeating rifle and that in case of an onslaught many, if not all, of them would bite the dust. Standing upon the breastworks built around the House of Representatives by its rules is the Iron Duke, clothed with an authority and power greater than any other individual. In one hand he carries the key to the political pie counter, by which he is enabled to reward the faithful; and in the other hand he carries a sword of destruction, by which he can mete out punishment and death to those who refuse to obey his mandates!

One of the arguments made by the insurgents against the wonderful power of the Speaker, as given him by the rules, has been that every Member of the House is in constant fear of the Speaker's power. While the Speaker may never demand in so many words that any particular action be taken, yet every Member of the House knows that at all times the Speaker has been able, and is able, to control the action of a very large portion of the House through the power that the rules give him, by which he can take off the political head of any Member who becomes too independent, and by which he is able to reward any other Member who is good and follows the leadership of the machine.

Those who have stood by the rules have denied this argument and have said that while the particular rule gave to the Speaker a great deal of power, at the same time no Speaker would be so unreasonable as to use that power to punish Members of the House who exercised their own judgment in voting upon different propositions and refused to follow the leadership of the House machine.

This argument, made by the insurgents and denied by the so-called regulars, has been absolutely clinched by the action of the Speaker in the appointment of the committees of the House of the present Congress.

It was found when these appointments were made that every man who had been in any way prominent in opposing the Speaker's machine had been punished and discriminated against by the Speaker in the appointment of committees.

Every insurgent who was a chairman of any committee was removed from such position. Those who were not chairmen and who were in any way prominent in the fight were taken off the important committees, where they had been for several years, and put upon insignificant and unimportant committees that seldom, if ever, have a meeting.

In other cases Members who had by long and continuous service reached nearly the top of important committees were taken from the top and placed at the bottom.

The Speaker had by this action done two things—he had given the lie to the argument made by those who favored his machine, wherein they claimed that this great power had not been and never would be used by the Speaker to punish Members, and second, he had absolutely demonstrated that the claim made by the insurgents was true, that by virtue of the Speaker's great power men were punished for following the dictates of their own conscience and were rewarded for following the leadership of the machine.

It was found when the committees were announced that not only had the insurgents been punished, but that every man who had originally started out as an insurgent and who had left their ranks and finally voted with the machine had been rewarded by important committee appointments.

SHALL WE HAVE ONE-MAN RULE?

Even if we admit for the sake of argument that the insurgents, in demanding a change of the rules, were wrong, what excuse can be offered on the part of the Speaker for using his official position to punish Members for having the courage to follow their conscientious convictions?

These men had by their course practically said that they believed the Speaker had too much power delegated to him by the rules of the House.

By what course of reasoning can any intelligent man justify the Speaker for using his official position in punishing fellow-Members for pursuing a course that every sensible man must admit was within the limits of their constitutional right?

If it be admitted that the Speaker was right in the use of his official power to punish fellow-Members because they did not agree with him, then it logically follows that the Member who comes to Congress must smother his own individual ideas and individual convictions whenever they are in conflict with the ideas of the Speaker.

The result of this would be to turn over the legislation of the Nation, as far as the House of Representatives is concerned, to one man.

If this course is desirable, then as a matter of economy the Constitution should be changed, and instead of electing Members to the House of Representatives, the power ought to be delegated to the Danville (Ill.) congressional district, or some other individual district, to transact the entire business of the House.

The following contribution written by Mr. William Bayard Hale on the subject appeared in the April number of *World's Work*:

THE SPEAKER OR THE PEOPLE?—AN ACCOUNT OF THE SYSTEM UNDER WHICH THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES HAS ABDICATED.

"For what purpose does the gentleman rise?"

The gentleman has been chosen by 200,000 American citizens to represent them in the Congress of the United States.

He states the purpose for which he rises. He desires to move the passage of a bill.

"The gentleman is not recognized for that purpose."

There is no other bill in debate, no resolution under discussion. There is no order of the day demanding precedence. The previous question has not been moved. The gentleman's purpose is not opposed to recognized public policy; it is not subversive of orderly procedure of the House; it is not idiotic nor frivolous nor indecent. There is no reason why the gentleman should not be recognized—except that back of the marble pulpit stands another gentleman with white chin whiskers, a white waistcoat, and a carnation in his buttonhole, who doesn't favor the passage of the bill, and who doesn't propose to permit Congress to pass it.

There are in the room some 300 other gentlemen sitting at creaking lines of desks, on whose mahogany tops the yellow light beats down from a grilled ceiling. These gentlemen are supposed to be engaged in making laws for the good of the country. The supposition is held

only by the constituents at home—the gentlemen themselves are under no delusion as to their position. They are humble petitioners at the foot of the throne occupied by the tall figure in a white waistcoat, with a pink carnation in his buttonhole, a white whisker under his chin, and a gavel in his left hand.

The three hundred and odd others know full well that they can pass no measure, debate no measure, amend no measure, without the consent of the tall man. They understand that the fate of their desires is in his hands. They are aware that their own personal careers may be made or ruined by his humor or his whim. They know that, except as a group of petitioners whose constant importunities secure small favors, they would as well be at home, leaving JOSEPH G. CANNON alone with the clerks and the business of Congress. They know it, because it is their own doing. Nobody has wrested their power from them. They have abdicated. They themselves passed the rules which authorize Mr. CANNON, among other things, to refuse them recognition.

The people of the United States have heard a great deal about Cannonism. They know that Congress has at last risen against it. The people know what Cannonism is, but perhaps they are not quite clear as to why Cannonism is, or how it works. Few outside Washington have any clear idea of what the conditions in Congress are. The people ought to hear the story, if for no other reason than that it is such an amazing one—so amazing that it might seem to be not the sober truth, but some grotesque and gigantic joke. But it is a story which should be told, besides, because the telling should warn the Nation to insist on a thorough revolution in congressional methods. The fall of Mr. CANNON will not, in itself, mean the destruction of the tyrannical system by which Mr. CANNON rules. It is, after all, the system, not the man, that has reduced the popular branch of the national legislature to impotence abject and complete.

The system, in outline, is not difficult to understand. In practice it grows complicated—and funnier—or uglier. But the prime facts are these.

THE SOURCES OF THE SPEAKER'S POWER.

One fact. The gentlemen of Congress ask the Speaker to name the standing committees and their chairmen. The real work of Congress, as everybody knows, is done by its standing committees. Some of these are more important than others; appointment to the important ones is much desired. A Congressman's career depends on his membership in good committees. A Congressman secures and retains such membership solely and alone by the Speaker's favor. By tradition new Members are entitled to expect assignments only to poor committees, and old Members to better ones. Chairmanships are expected to fall to "ranking" members of the committees. JOSEPH G. CANNON pays little attention to these expectations. His own will, his own personal likes and dislikes, his own plans and purposes, determine absolutely the position of every Member of the House.

We have, then, this farcical situation: Congressmen come to the House by virtue of election by the people. But they can do nothing in the House except through the House's committees. They go to committees by virtue of JOSEPH G. CANNON's appointment. Their principal obligation, then, is to him—and never for a moment are they permitted to forget this.

The other fact. Before he has named the committees, oh, yes! decidedly, before he has named the committees the Speaker asks the House to adopt the rules of the preceding Congress. Under the Speakership of JOSEPH G. CANNON, to vote against the rules means to forfeit all chances of appointment to good committees.

They are excellent rules. They do what they intend to do with a thoroughness beautiful to reflect upon. They leave the Members of Congress nothing. They confer all power upon the Speaker. Since they can not foresee the details of every parliamentary situation and necessity, they create a permanent Committee on Rules to carry out the Speaker's further will. He is its chairman. Should any Congressman at any time presume to offer any amendment to the rules, it is (beautiful thought!) by the rules themselves referred to the Committee on Rules. They are excellent rules, "bull-proof and sky-high," according to the western Members. They are renewed at the beginning of each session. The humor of Congress is perennial.

Last spring there was a contest against the rules. Thirty-one insurgents, led by Mr. NORRIS of Nebraska, Mr. MURDOCK of Kansas, and Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin—gentlemen without a sense of humor—raised their voices for a change. They would have got the change but for the kindly assistance which 23 Democratic Congressmen hastened to extend to the Republican Speaker. A Mr. FITZGERALD, of Brooklyn, led his brethren to the defense of Mr. CANNON's endangered throne. The night before the opening of the session, March 15, 1909, the Tammany Congressmen each received a telegram, "Vote for Fitzgerald amendment." Ever mindful of the downtrodden, and grateful to his friends, Mr. CANNON is understood, shortly after, to have extended his hand to Albany and prevented the Republican legislature of New York from passing certain anti-Tammany legislation. Certainly he selected Mr. FITZGERALD, the opponent of the Democratic leader of the House, for one of the two Democratic members of the Committee on Rules. By virtue of the appointment this man becomes Democratic leader in Mr. CLARK's absence from the floor. He was, in fact, in charge of the east side of the House when the fateful Norris amendment, taking away from the Speaker the right to appoint the House quota of the Ballinger investigation committee came up. Certainly Mr. CANNON promoted the Democrats who came to his assistance, and demoted the Republican insurgents. He removed Mr. NORRIS from the important Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and interred him in a dead Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. He deposed Mr. COOPER, who had been chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs ever since its formation, and removed him from the committee altogether. He deposed and separated from the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department Mr. HAUGEN, who had been its chairman for two Congresses. And so on.

THE BULL-PROOF RULES.

The rules of the Sixty-first Congress deserve better of literature than their practical character is likely to vouchsafe them. They deserve the study and admiration of all who would understand the art of saying much in little, or, rather, of doing much in saying little. For instance, when they mean that no Member may speak without Mr. CANNON's permission, they merely say that a Member may, "on being recognized," proceed. But you will search the rules in vain for any clause or phrase which puts the Speaker under any obligation to recognize a Member. The Speaker has, however, under arrangement previously made, recognized Members who were not present. Why do not gentlemen who can not get recognition at the hands of the Speaker appeal from the Speaker? Because they have to be recognized before they can appeal.

Excellent as the rules are, however, they would be inadequate without the constant watchfulness of the Committee on Rules.

The designation of this admirable body gives little or no notion of its function. The "rules" with which it is occupied are the special methods of procedure by which legislation is accelerated or stopped—special steps for particular bills.

Thus the committee—that is, Mr. CANNON in the form of the committee—will bring in a "rule" that a certain measure is to be debated not more than one hour. It will go further. It will supply a "rule" that no amendment may be offered to a certain measure. Or it will even provide a "rule" that only one specified amendment may be offered. It will give the very language of the amendment which may be offered.

This is the sort of a rule under which the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was passed, and here, as well as anywhere, a few remarks may be made on that amazing performance.

HOW CONGRESSMEN MAKE A TARIFF.

There are a great many items in a tariff bill; the Payne-Aldrich schedule had 4,000 items. Most of them nobody in Congress wanted to debate; but there were some which Congressmen did most emphatically want to debate—woolens, yarn, worsteds cotton. With woolen manufacturing companies declaring dividends of from 15 per cent to 57 per cent, there is no doubt in the world that lower rates would have been secured for these necessities had Congress been allowed to get at them. Congressmen would have liked to get at the tariff on petroleum, which was coming in with a countervailing duty.

They were not permitted to do so. When the tariff bill came finally before the House, it was under the "rule" (April 3, 1909) which provided that no amendment should be in order except as regards barley, barley malt, hides, and lumber, and that there should "be in order a single amendment in regard to petroleum, such amendment being in words and figures as follows: 'Crude petroleum and its products, 25 per cent ad valorem.'"

That is to say, the 391 Members of Congress sent to Washington by the people of the United States for the purpose of legislating for them were to be allowed to pass a tariff bill thoughtfully prepared for them by "the leaders;" they were to be allowed to express any dissatisfaction they might feel with this tariff bill to this extent, namely, they might offer amendments affecting the price of barley, leather, and lumber, and they were also further graciously allowed to say that they preferred a 25 per cent ad valorem duty on oil to a countervailing duty on that necessity.

That represents the full extent to which the representatives of the people of the United States were, as Representatives on the floor of the House, allowed to participate in the framing of the tariff act under which we are now living.

The "rule" was made by Speaker CANNON, through his Committee on Rules.

THE FINE ITALIAN HAND AT WORK.

Back of the date of the reporting of the Payne bill to the House there is a little history in which the power of the Speaker comes out.

It was freely expected by both parties that the Ways and Means Committee's bill would put petroleum on the free list, Mr. PAYNE and every other Republican member of the committee being opposed to the countervailing duty. It was at the personal command of the Speaker, Mr. CANNON, and because of obligations owed and favors expected that these members repudiated their own convictions and turned their backs on the interest of the people. The row was tremendous. Several Members contemplated resigning their seats, feeling that they could never go back to their districts with the stigma upon them of having voted to put a duty on kerosene. But the Speaker's word was law. The committee put the duty on petroleum into the bill.

Outside of Congress itself it is difficult to appreciate the moral strength which has lain behind the Speaker's command. The Republican who disobeyed it became a political outcast. His career was closed. His constituents were, in some mysterious way, given to understand that their Member had no influence and could do nothing for them. The very doorkeepers refused to speak in public to the "insurgent" leaders. Their wives were socially ostracized. It is not to be wondered at that the members of Mr. CANNON's best committee came to see, eye to eye, with him on the subject of petroleum.

We might stop here a moment to consider tariff reform in its progress through Congress. We observe that—

The tariff was framed initially by a committee of Mr. CANNON's appointment;

In the progress of its work Mr. CANNON personally imposed his will upon its members;

When it emerged from this one of his committees, another of his committees, by "rule" forbade amendment by Congressmen except on a few specified subjects, on one of which the very language of the only permitted amendment was furnished.

Mr. CANNON, in his own person or in that of one of his lieutenants, presided over Congress when it "deliberated," under the rule of his committee, on the bill framed by his committee under his imposed influence.

Mr. CANNON made the committee which framed the original bill; Mr. CANNON entered that committee when it was about to express an opinion of its own and bent it to his will; Mr. CANNON refused to allow Congress to alter the bill he submitted save in 4 of its 4,000 particulars, and dictated the language of the only allowable alternative in one of these four cases; Mr. CANNON controlled the parliamentary procedure of the House when, under these conditions, it was permitted the formality of passing the bill.

Finally, Mr. CANNON appointed the conferees who "represented" the House in the discussion of "its" differences with the Senate. In doing this Mr. CANNON passed over Mr. HILL, of Connecticut, whose rank on the Committee on Ways and Means entitled him to a place on the conference committee, and Mr. NEEDHAM, of California, both fair men, who would have faithfully represented the House bill, and put in their places Mr. CALDERHEAD and Mr. FORDNEY, men whose aim in life is to keep the tariff up. The House had voted a duty of \$1 per thousand on rough lumber; the Senate a duty of \$1.50. Mr. FORDNEY is a lumber dealer. He had voted in the committee for a \$2 duty. He had said on the floor of the House, "I sweat blood every time they reduce a schedule." Mr. CANNON could have had but one purpose in appointing these men to the conference committee, namely, not to represent the will of the House, but to defeat it.

This is a just and even moderate account of the facts. Does it constitute an account of anything recognizable as republican government, or is it the most complete caricature, the most entertaining travesty, the most uproarious farce, the hugest joke, of which republican government has ever been the subject?

UNPREMEDITATED INCIDENTAL COMEDY.

The best farces are sometimes made more laughable by fortuitous circumstances. Powerful as the Speaker is, he is not infallible. Occasionally sharp practice is too sharp. History supplies us here with a touch of unpremeditated comedy.

To the amendment—the only one on which Congress was to be allowed to vote—to the amendment "crude petroleum and its products, 25 per cent ad valorem," Mr. NORRIS, of Nebraska, not having the fear of the Lord before his eyes, astounded the whole House by offering an amendment to strike out the figures "25" and substitute therefore the figure "1." This was in Committee of the Whole, and the Speaker had put Mr. OLMSTED into the chair. He ruled it out of order to offer an amendment to this amendment. But the House saw its opportunity. Voices cried out, appealing from a ruling so glaringly wrong, and a rousing majority sustained the appeal. Mr. NORRIS's amendment was therefore in order. Mr. CANNON, his plan upset and his reign temporarily suspended, was compelled to take the floor, like an ordinary Member. He ranted, raved, besought, and vituperated, for once in vain. On the roll call the House, for a moment released and jubilant, voted 322 to 47—7 to 1—for free oil.

It was due solely to an accidental miscarriage of the Speakership programme that Congress got what 85 per cent of its Members wanted. Except for an accident, the country would have been saddled with a 25 per cent duty on oil, to which a 7-to-1 majority of the people's Representatives in Congress was opposed.

HOW CONGRESS VOTED AN EMERGENCY BILL.

Let not this little misadventure of the Speaker divert attention from the method by which generally he has saved Congress the labor of thinking out its legislation for itself. The chief elements of the method are the Speaker's power of appointment and his Committee on Rules. He has influenced the fate of proposed legislation through the power of assignment to what committee he chose; he has controlled every committee to the extent of having created its membership and its chairman; he has influenced the opinions and votes of Congressmen through all-powerful favors, threats, and promises; he has shut off debate and estopped amendments through his "rules;" he has presided over the "deliberations" which his "rules" allow; he has recognized or refused to recognize according as the purpose of the Congressman who presumes to speak was or was not agreeable to him.

There was the case of the currency bill of two years ago. An emergency existed in the country; money was direly needed and demanded. A bill was proposed in the Senate providing for the issue of an emergency currency based on railroad and other securities. It was soon seen to be altogether unacceptable to the House. The Speaker appointed a special committee, which in due course brought in what was known as the Vreeland bill. This was fairly agreeable to the sentiments of Congressmen. It was referred to a conference committee appointed by Mr. CANNON. This committee reported back to the House on the eve of adjournment, in the midst of general confusion and anxiety. In such haste was its report prepared that the printed copies laid on Members' desks were full of misprints. Pages were not even numbered. It was found that the bill now recommended was the original House bill with the Senate bill tacked onto it. This came up under a suspension of the rules.

What could be done? Nothing could be done except to pass the bill or pass no bill. The Speaker had so arranged that Congress could give the country such relief as could be given under the measure which Congress didn't want—or leave it without relief. The American people are a practical people. They ask for results, not reasons. A Representative who went home and explained that he had voted against the only currency bill it was possible to pass, because he didn't like half of its provisions, would never have gone to Washington again. The House swallowed the Senate bill.

THE TRICK RIDER.

The Speaker constantly has recourse to the amusing trick of defeating the will of the House by having its committees tack objectionable provisions onto bills otherwise acceptable. He did this, in a curiously sapient way, with the bill compelling publication of campaign expenses. Mr. CANNON has gone up and down the country declaring that the Democrats defeated this measure—wretches that they are, incapable of understanding the beauties and glories of a pure election. So, indeed, did the dastardly Democrats. But this is why:

Mr. McCALL, of Massachusetts, originally introduced the bill in question (H. R. 20112) in the first session of the Sixtieth Congress. It was referred to the Committee on the Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress. Here it received the warm championship of Mr. NORRIS, of Nebraska. The chairman of the committee, Mr. GAINES, had his doubts about the bill, but only one member, Mr. BURKE, of Pennsylvania, was against it. Mr. NORRIS secured the approval of Mr. DALZELL and Mr. PAYNE, who attended a committee meeting and advised that it would be good Republican politics to report favorably. This was now unanimously resolved on, and Judge NORRIS was unanimously asked to take charge of the bill on the floor. It was reported back April 20.

Mr. NORRIS found that he could get no recognition for the purpose of putting the bill on its passage. He made his call on the Speaker and was flatly told that the bill was nonsense and no chance would be given it. Mr. CANNON's characterization of the folly of such sentimental twaddle was eloquent and clear. Nothing would move him to recognize the representative of the committee with his motion to pass the bill.

On May 12, however, Mr. CRUMPACKER, of Indiana, was recognized with a publicity bill which bore the same number as the committee bill and consisted of it, with the addition of four new sections. These had no reference to publicity for contributions, but were regulations against election frauds, drawn from federal statutes of reconstruction days, directed at the South. They had been tacked onto the publicity bill with the deliberate purpose of solidifying the southern vote against the measure. In this loaded form the bill was rushed through the House, but, as was expected and intended, the southern Senators secured its defeat in the Senate.

Was it the wicked Democrats or the Speaker who defeated the campaign-expenses publication bill?

THE PRIVILEGE OF TALKING.

The degree to which the Speaker controls the time in Congress has been another source of his autocracy.

One thing that the public does not understand is that the House of Representatives is in session for only a very few minutes of the day—for a minute or two after 12 o'clock, and for five or six minutes just before 5 o'clock in the afternoon. There are hundreds of Members who never made a speech and scores who never made a motion in the

House—not because they are lazy, but because they are not allowed to speak or make a motion in the House.

When the Speaker's gavel falls after the Chaplain's "Amen," any Member has the theoretical right to rise and make a motion. As a matter of fact and as a rule, only those who have beforehand obtained permission of the Speaker will be recognized. Usually only one Member is recognized, and his motion is that the House now go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for a particular purpose, which the motion specifies.

The House then goes into Committee of the Whole. There is no physical change save that the silver mace is taken down from the marble column on which it has stood for three minutes, and the Speaker leaves the chair, calling one of his lieutenants to the easier task of keeping control of the committee.

For, be it known, the Speaker and the organization remain in control even when the House is sitting as the comparatively harmless Committee of the Whole. The Chairman immediately recognizes, not the first gentleman who rises, but the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill. He, now in possession of the floor, yields his time piecemeal for five, ten, or twenty minutes, to Members who desire to speak. For so long a Member may speak; with unanimous consent, he may speak even longer; at all events, he will be given unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record to any length, for most of his speaking is for home consumption.

Only, be it remembered, the privilege of talking does not necessarily imply the right of doing anything else. The Committee of the Whole is in session for a specified purpose, and any motion aside from that purpose is out of order.

Not that the speeches made in Committee of the Whole need confine themselves to the bill which is supposed to be under consideration. Frequently the "leaders" desire to drag out general discussion for days, so that there will be no time for the House to take up certain legislation which they don't want considered. On the other hand, when it is desired to shorten the debate, debate can easily be limited or instantly cut off. It is true that under the "five-minute rule," when the bill in Committee of the Whole is read by paragraphs, any Member has a right to offer an amendment and to speak on it, if he desires, for five minutes. But this practice may be, and is, when the organization desires it, suspended.

WORKING UNDER "SUSPENSION."

It is under "suspension of the rules" that many of the Speaker's little practical jokes are performed. Here is a true and entertaining narrative:

A bill containing an appropriation of \$423,000 for the purchase of a parcel of 400 acres of land in the District of Columbia to add to Rock Creek Park was referred by Mr. CANNON to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. A subcommittee viewed the land and concluded that it was not worth the price, nor anything like the price, and, on this opinion, the committee reported adversely as to this item.

A little later, nevertheless, a separate bill containing this one appropriation alone was introduced into the Senate. It passed the Senate. When this bill came to the House, the Speaker this time referred it, not to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which was informed upon the subject and which had once reported against it as a graft, but to the Committee on Appropriations. This committee reported it back with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. TAWNEY, of Minnesota—a particular CANNON devotee—was recognized by the Speaker and moved the passage of the bill. A spirited fight followed. The truth was told, and the House, unwilling to vote an appropriation which had in its hearing been denounced as this one had been, defeated the bill on roll call by a vote of 57 yeas to 164 nays. This may be found in the RECORD of the first session of the Sixtieth Congress, pages 6998-7003. The date was May 26, 1908.

This ought to have ended the matter. It did not. On the evening of March 3, 1909, in the same Congress, a few hours before its expiration, when all was haste, confusion, and noise, a Member who had served on the subcommittee which had reported against the purchase happened to pass by the Clerk's desk. His ear was struck by the words "zoological park," and he stopped and listened to the bill which the Clerk was reading. He recognized the identical old bill which the House had voted down. Without any further consideration by a committee, without any further report, and yet without change of a word, a syllable, a letter, or a punctuation mark, here it was again on its passage in an hour of uproar and confusion, when no one on the floor was likely to note it. A motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill had been made by Mr. SMITH, chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. The subcommittee member demanded a second and then communicated his misgivings to Mr. DAVIS, of Minnesota, who volunteered to sound Mr. SMITH. The conversation ran something like this:

"SMITH, what is this bill?"

"Why, it's a bill to add 400 acres to the Zoological Park."

"Well, what about it?"

"Oh, I don't know. I suppose we ought to do all we can for parks, and all that sort of thing. I really don't know much about it." The Speaker asked me to see it through.

A few words of explanation—that is to say, a few words calling public attention to what otherwise would have been done in secret—doomed the bill. It was defeated, 31 yeas to 192 nays, which may be found in the RECORD of the second session of the Sixtieth Congress, pages 3787, 3788, and 3792-3794.

DID THE CONSTITUTION MEAN THIS?

It must by now be fairly clear how the Speaker may dictate, and has all but absolutely dictated, the action of the House by controlling its time and its parliamentary procedure, after having constituted its working committees and made himself a perennial fount of special "rules." The system is well-nigh perfect, the abdication of the power of Representatives is as nearly complete as anything can be in this imperfect world.

The Speaker may bury any bill privately; he may determine the shape in which it shall come out of committee, if he allows it to come out at all. He may dictate whether or not a bill, after having been reported, shall be put on its passage; whether or not Members may speak on it or offer to amend it. He may, and on important measures does, prevent Members doing more than voting aye or nay on a particular and fully formulated bill. They may have debated and passed the tellers on a hundred amendments dealing with the minutiae of a bill, only to find that on the final vote for passage they have to accept or reject a totally different bill—or one which utterly ignores all their debates and votes—find that they have, after all, only the alternative

of accepting a measure with provisions which they have stricken out or without provisions which they have put in, or go without any legislation. Congress still has a veto on the Speaker, but that is about all it has.

The advantages of the condition to which Congress has been reduced are many. For one thing, Members have been saved from the necessity of studying public questions; after their first term few Members have even pretended to study them. For another thing, progressive legislation has been discouraged. It is hard and practically impossible to get any measure of social or political progress past the Speaker. Just as Mr. CANNON stood against a downward revision of the tariff and a scientific currency bill and postal reform and immigration restriction, so he stands against railway rate regulation, a parcels post, a postal-savings system, direct election of Senators, an income-tax bill, pure-food legislation, waterways improvements, and the conservation of forest and coal lands and water power. Under him the House has become the chief bulwark of conservatism.

Congress has another privilege—it may petition the Speaker. Petition him a Member must if he wants a chance to speak or make a motion in the House.

Mr. HEFLIN, member of the Committee on Agriculture, asked unanimous consent to call up a bill, already unanimously recommended by the committee, making it unlawful for government employees to divulge government cotton statistics prior to publication. Mr. PAYNE objected. A hundred Members then signed a petition requesting the Speaker to recognize Mr. HEFLIN for this purpose. He arose again, and was again refused recognition. When he expostulated, the Speaker said: "The Chair had reason to suppose there would be objection." There had been no objection. There would have been none, for Mr. HEFLIN had observed Mr. PAYNE'S absence. Mr. HEFLIN went up to the Speaker's stand and privately besought recognition, but Mr. CANNON told him that he had agreed with Mr. PAYNE not to allow the bill to be called up in the latter's absence. The Speaker had promised one Member to deprive another Member of his rights, to spurn the prayer of a quarter of the House, and to defeat a meritorious measure. Page 1093 of the RECORD (Thursday, Jan. 27, 1910) will confirm this incident.

If this is what the Constitution meant by making the House of Representatives its first-named and chief creation, if this is what the national legislature is maintained for, then all is well, except that the elaborate election machinery and the considerable expense involved in returning 391 Congressmen might be spared. A one-man Congress might be more economically maintained than it is under the present system.

The Constitution apparently erred in supposing that the people desired direct representation at the Capitol. By a curious irony, the Senate, the aristocratic body, has become more truly representative of the people than the popular branch of Congress. While in England the House of Commons is asserting and extending its power, in America the people's Representatives have surrendered their authority.

How did this come about? By the appearance, at the proper historic moment, of the figure whose talents this article celebrates. Mr. CANNON was not a commanding influence when he was on the floor of the House. Strict party regularity gained him good committee appointments, but it was charged against him then that prominent among his traits of character were narrow-mindedness, cunning, and vanity. Lifted to power, these traits became conservatism, sagacity, and administrative force.

The speakership system existed for years without developing its beneficent possibilities. The rules are essentially what they were in the day of Reed, Crisp, and Henderson. It required the combination of the system and the personality, characterize it how one may, of JOSEPH G. CANNON.

It required more; it required the incentive furnished in the social-political crisis which the country is to-day facing. Compared with the conflict now opening between wealth and manhood, privilege and equal opportunity, the political struggles of the past have been sport. Privileged wealth realized the seriousness of the coming fight before the people realized it. Wealth entrenched itself in Congress. Recognizing the possibilities in the speakership, it built up its organization around that office. Mr. CANNON, a man who belongs to another age of public morality, a statesman into whose brain no glimmer of the social truths which inspire the progressive public men of the day could possibly penetrate, became its capable instrument. When we speak of Mr. CANNON, then, we mean the machine, the organization, on which the preservation of the privileges of wealth depend.

Mr. CANNON'S efficiency is indisputable. Unfortunately, it became so complete that it has overreached itself.

Mr. CANNON will not remain in the speakership longer than the close of the present Congress. Perhaps not till then. How his final overthrow will be accomplished may not be predicted, but, since the vote of January 7, it is certain. The "insurgents" of yesterday will be the heroes of a successful revolution to-morrow.

But what will it avail, now that the possibilities of the system have been developed, what will it avail to depose a particular tyrant and clothe another man with the power which he possessed? If the people's Representatives at the Capitol are to resume their constitutional rights and duties, the elimination of CANNON must be followed by a repudiation of the rules which made Cannonism possible.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, one thing further. I now, by consent, yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KOPP].

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is urgent cause for pension legislation at this session of Congress. I doubt whether there will be time for all of those who wish to discuss this question to do so. The bill (H. R. 18899) creating a volunteer retired list, and for other purposes, is on the calendar.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take the time of the committee in discussing it, for so much has been said covering all phases of the question that it seems like surplussage for another to add his views on the subject.

The bill in question does not provide for such a readjustment of our pension laws as I should like to see, but it does extend a measure of relief to the volunteer officers of the civil war, and to some, at least, of the privates who went forth to serve their country in its hour of direst need. Section 5 provides:

That any person who served as an enlisted man ninety days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the civil

war and who has been honorably discharged therefrom, and whose physical or mental condition is of such degree of disability as to require the frequent and periodical aid and attention of another person, shall, upon application, have his name placed on the volunteer retired list created by this act, and shall receive, in lieu of all pensions, retired pay at the rate of \$30 per month during the period of his natural life.

Sec. 6. That this act is in recognition of sacrifices made and services rendered in the civil war for the defense of the United States Government and the preservation of the Union, and shall take effect immediately.

The first part of this bill provides for a "civil war volunteer officers' retired list," placing officers who served a given length of time upon practically one-third pay, but it is further provided that this shall not apply to any person who has not arrived at the age of 70 years. This bill is being opposed, it is said, by some Regular Army officers. Now, why is this? We have a great many officers of the Regular Army upon the retired list who know little or nothing of actual warfare. I am not complaining, for I am glad that they are receiving assistance at the hands of their country. What I am pleading for are the volunteer officers and privates who took their lives in their hands and went south in 1861 in their country's defense. You may search the pages of history in vain to find a record of more gallant officers or braver men than those who fought at Vicksburg, Franklin, Antietam, Gettysburg, Petersburg, and many other battles too numerous to mention.

Is there any reason why these officers should not be placed upon the retired list with a reasonable pension when the Regular Army officer is placed there to-day?

We are enacting special pension bills nearly every week, and while I am always glad to vote for them, I feel that, at the best, it is legislation in favor of the few to the exclusion of the many. No doubt every Congressman receives dozens of applications for special bills to every one he is able to have passed by Congress. I might take from my files 50 applications for special bills. Of these Congress will see fit to pass perhaps 5 or 6. Those who do not get special legislation are just as needy and served their country just as honorably as those who do, and thus I say that this special legislation at the best is favoritism.

Now, the proposed bill seeks to give all soldiers who would be entitled to special pension legislation under existing law the benefits thereof and place them on the rolls at \$30 per month. It includes all persons who served ninety days or more during the civil war and who were honorably discharged therefrom and who are in such physical or mental condition as to require the frequent and periodical aid of another person. This will include, it is estimated, at least 12,000 men, and I am in favor of this bill because it extends adequate relief to 12,000 men, where perhaps only 1,000 could receive that aid by due course of legislation before their deaths under existing law.

But why should we stop with this bill? Why not pass a bill such as has been introduced, raising the rates of pension, under the age law, all along the line? I favor a bill which gives every old soldier who served ninety days and was honorably discharged \$17 per month when he reaches the age of 62 years; \$20 when he reaches the age of 65 years; \$30 when he reaches the age of 70 years; and \$40 when he reaches 75. I do not believe we should wait until the old soldier has one foot in the grave before we extend to him adequate relief. The great civil war has no comparison in the world's history. Other wars have been bloody; in other wars human life has been ruthlessly sacrificed; but in no other contest did as many men volunteer and march to the front in defense of their country's flag. The great civil war is now but dimly seen in the past. It will soon be but a memory for a few, and in a short time we will read of it as we now speak of the Revolutionary war. The States that then fought each other with bitterness are now marching as brothers, carrying their country's banner in the front, determined that our Nation shall be the first in industry, first in the extension and broadening of the field of human rights to which all men are entitled. There is just one thing that can be done as a Nation to show our hearty appreciation of the services rendered and sacrifices made by those who went forth in the enthusiasm of young manhood in 1861 and by their sacrifices preserved the unity of our Nation. We are told that to increase their pensions would be to increase our national expenditures by millions of dollars. That is true. Of course it will cost something, but, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I will remind you that it cost something in a million homes and more in this country, from 1861 to 1865, when the father, the brother, or the son left all that was near and dear to him, left what little property he had accumulated, and marched away behind his country's flag, many never to return. It cost something to the mother who received a message that her boy was killed, and that she would never see him again until she met him before the white throne above. It cost something on the part

of the wife, as she sat in the little home with her children huddled about her, and read that her husband fell at Antietam or Gettysburg. It cost something when the mortgages became due on hundreds of homes all over the land, and the bread-winners were absent and could not meet the obligation. It cost something when our country was assaulted, and gold brought \$2.76 to \$2.85 in greenbacks on Wall street, which meant that the greenback, our country's obligation, if you please, was worth less than 28 cents in gold.

The facts and figures are set forth in an article recently published by the National Tribune, that paper which is a true friend of the old soldier, with such clearness as to be almost astounding. Early's troops were within striking distance of Washington, and President Lincoln was calling for help. At that time the public debt was \$2,300,000,000, nearly one-sixth the total value of all property of the United States, according to the census of 1860. The greenbacks in circulation amounted to \$455,000,000, and with other paper money we had a total circulation of \$833,000,000. This was all in the balance when President Lincoln was calling for aid and begging men to come to the defense of their country's flag. Not only that, but there was \$2,300,000,000 in Government bonds, the stability and soundness of which depended upon the success of the Union troops. Not only that, but every State, county, and municipality in the Nation had bonds outstanding. Not only that, but every man who had property held either promissory notes, certificates of deposit, judgments, or some other obligation representing a promise to pay. Their value all depended upon the greenback being worth 100 cents on the dollar, for the greenback was the country's legal tender.

It has been stated in the article referred to that \$6,000,000,000 were involved at this time. The men who wore the blue, and who had left their homes and all that was near and dear to them, were asked to make this \$6,000,000,000 good, and they responded at Vicksburg, at Gettysburg, at Cold Harbor, at Franklin, on the march to the sea, and finally at Appomattox, where the battle flag was furled, forever and forever. In May, 1865, the greenback was worth nearly 74 cents, when eleven months before it was worth 38 cents, and in due time these same greenbacks were worth par value.

Grant, then, Mr. Chairman, that this increase in pensions will cost us a few million per year for only a few years more. But, I ask, Are not these same soldiers entitled to it from every standpoint? Mr. Chairman, if you should step in when a blow was aimed at me, which would mean my death, and save my life, I would never question any favor which you might ask at my hand. Neither should this Congress, nor any Member thereof, question the propriety of paying to the soldiers who wore the blue such a pension as will support them and their aged helpmates, as they near the sunset of life, in a manner at least satisfactory to them.

We have now grown to be the richest nation in the world. The American greenback is questioned nowhere. We have unlimited credit, and all preserved to us by the 2,000,000 men or more who threw in the balance their all, from 1861 to 1865. I say, Mr. Chairman, we are not giving them a pension, we should say, we are paying them a pension, paying an obligation which we owe just as much as though each old soldier held a promissory note of the Government, calling for the payment of a sufficient amount to support him until he is called by the Great Father to his home above.

I deprecate language on the floor of the House which would seem to indicate that we are giving old soldiers a pension—making them a present, if you please, as we make presents to our children and friends. That is neither fair to the old soldiers, or honorable to the men who take that position. We are doing nothing more or less than paying a debt, and far beyond this is another debt we can never hope to pay, and that is the great debt of gratitude.

So, Mr. Chairman, I trust that the bill referred to will pass without a dissenting vote. Some have stated on the floor that they are opposed to it because it does not extend relief to all the old soldiers. God knows this is true, and I only wish we might pass a bill which would extend relief to every old soldier, and I predict that before long such a bill will be passed. If we can not get relief for all, that is no reason why we should not extend it to thousands of old soldiers who are lying on their backs, requiring an attendant, or who are groping through the world in darkness because their eyesight is gone, or are sitting in their humble homes waiting patiently for the last bugle call. Under existing law, these men can not receive beyond the amount allowed by the age law, unless their disabilities were incurred in the line of duty. In heaven's name, do not vote against this bill because it does not take care of every old soldier, as much as we should like to see that, but let us pay at least one installment of the great debt we owe. I will admit

that it is hard to enact pension laws which are just and equitable, but I hope a law will be enacted at this session, or at least at the next session of Congress, which will give generous support to all old soldiers who wore the blue ninety days and were honorably discharged, and at the same time frame it in such a manner as to do equal justice to the short-service and long-service man.

In all fairness it seems that the man who served his country for four long years should receive a higher rate of pension than the man who served for ninety days, and so I say the law should be framed which would equitably protect the rights of both, and give to each a pension which will enable him to live comfortably for the remainder of his days. There is also urgent need for legislation giving relief to the widow who married a soldier subsequent to 1890.

Some one has said that the world hates no man as it hates an ingrate. Then, let it never be said that our country is an ingrate. In a few more years the last soldier will have answered taps—aye, sooner than we now imagine, for they are dying at a rapid rate. I see the old soldier sitting in his little home, perhaps in the North, perhaps in the East, in the West, or in the South, with his helpmate who has journeyed with him down the pathway of life. He is sitting there thinking of the days of long ago, and there comes before his mind picture after picture, making almost a perfect panorama. He sees himself again a young man, with his young wife and new babe starting to carve a home in the wilderness or build it on the plains. He gets the weekly newspaper and learns that the dreaded war has begun, and learns that the question which statesmen have been discussing for half a century has now come up for final solution by the sword and bayonet. He reads the call of President Lincoln for volunteers. He goes to town to do a little trading and hears the fife and drum calling for volunteers. The tears come to his cheek, his heart swells up within and almost chokes him. On the one hand is home and wife and all that is near and dear; on the other hand is his country. The battle fought in that man's bosom can not be pictured with brush or pen. It can only be felt by the human heart. He goes home; he fights the battle alone, and comes to the conclusion that he must go with his country. He tells his wife of his plans, and another battle is fought which can not be described in words. But she, too, is brave, aye, just as brave as he, and she tells him to go and serve his country, and she will take care of the babe and home.

As the old man sits in his little home to-day I can see him living the past again. His eyes are glistening as he looks into the distant past, and I can tell that the fire is burning as fiercely as of yore in the temple of clay, which is slowly crumbling away. Again he bids his wife good-by and is gone.

I see the old veteran as he pictures again the days, weeks, and months spent in his country's service, the hardships endured, the heartaches and pangs of anguish, the sorrow, when he learns of the death of his little babe. I can see that the old veteran in memory is fighting again the battles. Now he is at Gettysburg or in the Wilderness, and then he sinks back into his chair with a sigh of contentment, for he is at Appomattox, and peace has been declared. Now his eye gleams with pleasure and his face breaks into a smile, and I know that in memory he is again hurrying homeward to meet the loved one whom he left there four long years before.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that is but one picture that could be painted of thousands of homes in this land to-day. For one, I want to make that home just as happy, just as comfortable as it is possible to make it, and I believe that this can only be done by giving to the veteran and to the widows of thousands of others such a competency as will enable them at least to have the necessities of life. Let us pass this bill, and let us pass another one of the nature indicated in these brief remarks, and I believe that each one of us will go home when Congress adjourns with such a feeling in our hearts as only men can have who know that they have responded to the call of duty.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER].

DISCRIMINATING DUTIES, FREE SHIPS, AND FREE SHIP MATERIAL VERSUS SHIP SUBSIDY.

Mr. ALEXANDER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, for many years we have been confronted with a vanishing American merchant marine, and during the last twenty years the Republican party has put forward many bills, ostensibly to remedy the evil, but really to extend the Republican system of favoritism and privilege to shipbuilders, in order to enlarge the great number of plutocrats now prospering under protection at the expense of the greater body of the common people.

Some, like Carnegie, are already fat; others by the thousand are fattening at the public crib at public expense, and the Republican party seizes the vanishing American merchant marine as a patriotic means to enlarge the crib and to place new and hungry classes in the stalls to fatten on what they do not earn, to prosper without service or merit, to be supported at government expense. Republicans have portrayed our vanishing merchant marine most vividly and most persistently, but have never proposed a remedy of practical value, nor is the measure now under discussion an exception to the rule.

In 1896 the Republican platform contained one plank which, had its promise been redeemed, would have been a step forward in the real rehabilitation of our merchant marine. That section of the platform said:

We favor restoring the American policy of discriminating duties for the upbuilding of our merchant marine and the protection of our shipping in the foreign carrying trade, so that American ships, the product of American labor employed in American shipyards, sailing under the Stars and Stripes, and manned, officered, and owned by Americans may regain the carrying of our foreign commerce.

Rhetorically, this has the right jingle, and in the main strikes a responsive chord in every American heart. But it was not sincere; it was mere rhetoric, and was never designed for practical execution. Like the platform promise of tariff revision, it meant one thing before taking and another and quite a different thing after taking. The Republicans won in the struggle of 1896 and, whatever else they may have done, it is certain that they did not restore the American policy of discriminating duties, but began at once to substitute for this real American policy the foreign policy of subsidy.

In 1898 the Republican party produced a subsidy bill before which the country stood aghast, and which was overwhelmingly defeated. In 1899 that party produced a modification of this bill, which was in turn defeated. In 1907 the same party presented a further modification, which was further modified in 1908, and still further modified in the bill before us. In none of these bills, however, is there any attempt toward redeeming platform pledges, toward restoring the American policy of discriminating duties. In every case, however, we have been asked to indorse an un-American and unrighteous policy of subsidy.

Our present condition is not due to any fault of our shipbuilders or shipowners, but results and remains as the fruitage of Republican policy grounded on the bed rock of the protective tariff. Nor am I alone in this conclusion and belief. Let me quote from a prominent Republican of this House.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FASSETT], in a very able and eloquent defense of the ship-subsidy bill pending in the Sixtieth Congress, used this language:

This industry of carrying goods upon the high seas is the one American industry that has been slaughtered on the altar of protection. * * * I agree with the gentleman from Missouri for once, that the protective tariff has slaughtered our American merchant deep-sea marine.

What does this confession involve? Many crimes have been charged to the protective tariff, but none so stupendous and far-reaching as this.

Let me give you the gentleman's own statement of the condition of our American merchant marine to-day, after nearly a half century of Republican administration and Republican tariffs:

We have some trade with the growing markets of the world, but our goods are carried by our trade rivals. This was not always so.

No, thank God, it was not so under Democratic administration. Again he says:

One hundred years ago there was engaged in deep-sea foreign trade under our flag a total of 981,019 tonnage, more than we have to-day; one hundred years ago we carried in American ships 90 per cent of our trade. In 1861, the highest point we ever reached in deep-sea tonnage, the total number of tons was 2,496,894, and we carried 65 per cent of our own trade.

To-day, after fifty years of Republican administration—

He further adds—

In ships of all kinds—sailing vessels, steam vessels, and vessels of small size up to the largest size—all told, we have a tonnage of 940,068, and we are carrying less than 10 per cent of our trade.

There are less than 7 first-class steamers on the Atlantic plying between our ports and the ports of Europe; there are no steamers plying between South American ports and our own ports under the American flag, save 4 on the Red D Line to ports in the Caribbean Sea. There are but 6 on the Pacific Ocean engaged in the business of this country; we are already almost eliminated from the ocean carrying trade.

And further on in the same speech he states the humiliating fact that—

We are paying \$210,000,000 a year for transportation and importation of our goods in foreign trade.

Was ever a more humiliating confession made by a responsible member of any political party of the withering blight upon one of the great bulwarks of national strength and greatness

than had been made by the gentleman from New York on behalf of the Republican party?

Contemplate it, ponder it, and reflect upon its deep significance!

One hundred years ago 981,019 tons in the foreign trade under the American flag! Now, after a lapse of one hundred years of phenomenal growth in other directions we have only 940,068 tons under the American flag in the foreign trade; then American ships carried 90 per cent of our trade, now less than 10 per cent.

In 1861 our deep-sea tonnage was 2,496,894, and we carried 65 per cent of our trade. Now, after nearly fifty years, our tonnage has shrunk to 940,068 tons, and we pay more than \$200,000,000 to foreign ships to carry our commerce.

A full statement of our merchant marine, as to its carriage of our exports and imports, from the foundation of the Government to most recent times has been prepared by Mr. Bates, a former Commissioner of Navigation for the United States, together with the reasons for its decline, which will be found in the appendices annexed to my remarks.

CORRECTION OF A FEW WIDESPREAD ERRORS.

In view of the Frye-Hanna-Payne bill, which was contended for so vigorously by distinguished Republicans as good Republican doctrine, and which was a subsidy measure pure and simple, and in view of the widely disseminated Republican statements then and now that all great foreign governments subsidize their merchant marine, it may be well to quote from the last annual report of the Commissioner of Navigation, that for 1909, the report of the German foreign office, dated December 30, 1908, and sent to the embassy of the United States, the policy of Germany relative to subsidies. So much of error has been circulated by subsidy organizations throughout the country as to foreign policies that it becomes necessary to present authentic material from the highest official sources as corrective. The German foreign office (p. 237) says:

The Imperial Government has always been guided by the governing idea that shipbuilding and shipping do not admit of being artificially called into being by the application of state funds nor of being fostered to a degree overreaching their natural conditions of existence and development.

As a result of this point of view, the Imperial Government, in spite of the legislation of other States and despite the dangers to which the German flag is sometimes exposed in consequence of the favoring of foreign competition, has never permitted itself to be persuaded to place official funds at the disposal of its own merchant marine for the purpose mentioned. In this respect it has found itself in accord with the leading shipping circles in Germany, which have built themselves up by their own efforts and have always declared themselves against the granting of state subsidies; their endeavors have been directed toward preserving the freedom and independence of their transactions, which must otherwise necessarily have been subjected to a restriction in some degree.

Therefore shipbuilding and fitting-out bounties, voyage bounties (mile money), bounties accorded the merchant fleet for possible services in the interests of the navy, or bounties and subsidies of other kinds, have never been introduced into Germany.

Germany paid for ocean mail service in 1907 about \$2,301,029. It will be remembered that the very things which have never been introduced into Germany are the very things which Republicans in the Frye-Hanna-Payne bill sought to introduce into our laws, but which were denied admission by the overwhelming opposition of the country. It is true that the bill under consideration eliminates many of the objectionable features of the Frye bill, but it nevertheless remains that the subsidy idea dominates the mail-service idea, and its passage would be a step toward the ultimate introduction into our law of the monstrous provisions of the Frye bill.

GREAT BRITAIN.

So of Great Britain. In a report to the House of Commons in 1902 the committee on steamship subsidies said:

British policy has usually hitherto been to subsidize ships for postal or admiralty purposes only, and to exclude all consideration of trade interests.

THE FRENCH LAW.

France pays the largest subsidies in the world, despite the admitted fact that her trade has not advanced in anything like a corresponding proportion to the munificence of the subsidies; yet France does not owe her merchant marine to her subsidies.

The report of the committee on the French budget in 1899 answers the question, "Why should a Frenchman prefer to buy ships of an Englishman?" and incidentally discloses the policy of France which permits the purchase of foreign ships, their registration in France, and their right to participate in the half bounties for sailing service. The report says:

This preference (for foreign ships) has several causes. The English shipbuilder is able to obtain his iron, coal, machinery, and labor at a better price than ours. Besides, an English shipyard will deliver a vessel in nine months which would take twenty, and even thirty, months in a French shipyard. Cheapness and quick deliveries have decided our owners to buy their ships in foreign markets.

Subsidy advocates quote with approval the French policy of construction and sailing bounties as remedies for our vanished

merchant marine, but they fail to note at any place the "free-ship" policy of France, the policy that has given that country her merchant marine; a policy that, if adopted by us, would be followed by like results. Not only may a Frenchman buy his ship in the cheapest market, but under the law he may have one-half the subsidy bounty paid to ships built in French shipyards.

In Holland the mail subsidies may only be paid to ships built in Dutch yards, but if the Dutch shipbuilder can not, or will not, build as cheaply as ships are built abroad, then the owner may buy abroad and still compete for the subsidy. See special consular reports, "Merchant marine in foreign countries," Volume XVIII, pages 79-97.

HOUSE BILL 16362—THE HUMPHREY BILL.

The bill provides that the Postmaster-General is authorized to pay for ocean mail service, under the act of March 3, 1891, in vessels of the second class, on routes 4,000 miles or more in length, outward voyage, to South America, to the Philippines, to Japan, to China, and to Australasia, at a rate per mile not exceeding the rate applicable to vessels of the first class, as provided by said act, provided that the total expenditure for foreign mail service in any one year shall not exceed the estimated revenue therefrom for that service.

Section 3 of said act of March 3, 1891, provides that the vessels employed in the ocean mail service under said act shall be American-built steamships, owned and officered by American citizens, and upon each departure from the United States the following proportion of the crew shall be citizens of the United States, to wit: During the first two years of the contract for carrying the mails, one-fourth thereof; during the next three succeeding years, one-third thereof; and during the remaining time of the continuance of such contract at least one-half thereof.

Under said act vessels are divided into four classes, but House bill 16362 applies only to vessels of the first and second classes.

Under said act vessels of the first class are described as iron or steel screw steamships capable of maintaining a speed of 20 knots an hour at sea in ordinary weather, and of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 8,000 tons, and vessels of the second class shall be iron or steel steamships capable of maintaining a speed of 16 knots an hour at sea in ordinary weather and of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 5,000 tons.

Said section 3 further provides that it shall be stipulated in the contract for mail service that in addition to said mails the vessels may carry passengers with their baggage, as well as do all ordinary business done by steamships.

Section 5 of said act of March 3, 1891, further provides that the rate of compensation to be paid for ocean mail service of first-class ships shall not exceed \$4 per mile and for second-class ships \$2 per mile.

House bill 16362 authorizes the Postmaster-General to pay for ocean mail service in vessels of the second class the rate per mile applicable to vessels of the first class; that is, at a rate not exceeding \$4 per mile, or double the rate authorized under the act of March 3, 1891.

The last-named act further provides that said vessels shall take as cadets or apprentices one American-born boy under 21 years for each thousand tons gross register and one for each majority fraction thereof, who shall be educated in the duties of seamanship and receive reasonable pay for their services.

House bill 16362 amends said section and relieves vessels subsidized thereunder from performing said service as part compensation for their mail pay, and provides that they shall be compensated for carrying said cadets or apprentices by payments out of the Treasury equal to 80 per cent of the tonnage duties paid for each voyage.

It will be noted that substantially the only service to be rendered by subsidized vessels is the carrying of mails and a mail messenger, for which they will be entitled to the enormous compensation of \$4 per mile, or not less than \$16,000 for each outgoing voyage—without any reference to the quantity of mail matter carried. They will be entitled to the same compensation if they carry 1 letter, 1 post card, or 1 pound of other mail matter as they will be if they carry 1 ton of each.

To illustrate, for each outward voyage from New York to Buenos Aires a subsidized vessel would be entitled to \$23,472, the distance being 5,858 miles; and for each outward voyage from San Francisco to Valparaiso, a distance of 5,410 miles, a subsidized vessel would be entitled to receive \$21,640, without reference to the quantity of mail matter carried; to Hongkong, a distance of 6,086 miles, \$24,344; to Sydney, Australia, a distance of 6,488 miles, \$25,952; to Yokohama, Japan, a distance of 4,564 miles, \$18,256; to Manila, a distance of 6,254 miles, \$25,016, making the total for an outgoing voyage to all the points named of \$138,680, or for fortnightly trips \$3,323,200 per annum, which added to the subsidy now paid will make a grand total of \$4,455,560, and as there would be but \$3,486,086 profit in the ocean mail service, as estimated by the Postmaster-

General, the expenditure would be \$969,469 in excess of said estimated profit.

For the same service by nonsubsidized American vessels we are now paying 80 cents per pound for letters and post cards and 8 cents per pound for other articles, while foreign vessels are paid 35 cents a pound for letters and post cards and 4½ cents a pound for other articles.

The bill H. R. 16362 has one very attractive and misleading provision, that the total expenditure for foreign mail service in one year shall not exceed the estimated revenue therefrom for that year.

You will note that the bill does not say that the expenditures for ocean mail service in any one year shall not exceed the revenues therefrom for that year, but the estimated revenues.

How that revenue is to be estimated we are not told. Indeed, the law provides that the Postmaster-General shall enter into ocean mail contracts, if at all, for not less than five nor more than ten years.

How is he to ascertain what the profits of the service will be for the five-year period for which he lets the contract; and if he once enters into the contract, who will say that he will not be bound to pay the contract price without regard as to whether the service yields a profit to the Government or not, unless we assume that the vessel owner would be stupid enough to enter into a contract to perform the service, and make his compensation depend upon that contingency?

Therefore it behooves us to face the proposition squarely. It is the purpose of the bill to give the Postmaster-General power to enter into ocean mail contracts for periods of not less than five years, regardless of the profits of the service. He shall make an estimate, that is all. It may be correct or incorrect, no matter, when the contract is once let we must pay. His estimate then may be as erroneous as his present estimate.

He estimates the surplus now at \$2,358,840.48 a year, but in making this estimate he wholly ignores the cost of handling and transporting on land, which is a very material part of the cost. In estimating the service as a basis for ocean mail contracts he may be equally as reckless.

Of course, the profit of \$2,358,840 from the foreign mail service was not derived from the subsidized vessels, as the Postmaster-General would have us infer, and as subsidy papers throughout the country have inferred. It consisted to its largest extent of postage received from all foreign mail in excess of its cost of transmission. The payments to the subsidized lines had no relation to the postage from mails carried by them, and greatly exceeded the revenues derived from that restricted service. For our trans-Atlantic service in 1908 we paid \$1,555,050, of which the subsidized lines received \$737,016. The entire trans-Atlantic mail weight was about 9,600,000 pounds, of which the subsidized lines carried about 2,400,000 pounds. The subsidized lines carried one-fourth of the weight and took one-half the pay.

The profit is therefore earned by the nonsubsidized lines. Neither is it true that the \$2,358,840 is real profit. The deficit in the Post-Office Department last year was about \$17,000,000, and if this \$2,358,840 is used to pay subsidies the deficit will swell to nearly \$20,000,000, to be provided for by additional taxation.

Sections 2 and 3 of said bill (H. R. 16362) are well enough if the bill is enacted into law, as they provide that no part of the subsidy shall be paid to steamships owned or controlled by railroad companies, or to which railroad companies shall extend special privileges, and that subsidized steamships, under contract, shall not be sold without the consent of the Secretary of the Navy.

Section 4 provides for increased tonnage taxes. It is a matter of the most serious consideration whether or not this provision will divert shipping from our North Atlantic ports to Canadian ports and from our North Pacific ports to British Columbian ports.

Section 5 of the bill makes an allowance equivalent to 80 per cent of the tonnage duties paid by a vessel of the United States in respect of the entry in the United States of that vessel from a foreign voyage on proof that it has in such foreign voyage carried boys trained in seamanship, in proportion of one for each such vessel, and, in addition, one for each 1,000 tons of her net registered tonnage. Under the act of March 3, 1891, this duty of taking cadets or apprentices was required to be performed as part of the service to be rendered for the subsidy paid, but the Humphrey bill graciously relieves subsidized vessels of this service and compensates them therefor by remitting 80 per cent of the tonnage taxes paid. At the same time the Humphrey bill increases the subsidy from \$2 to \$4 a mile on 16-knot ships.

Section 6 is the free-ship section, and I regret to say is the only section in the bill that appeals to me. But, as stated in

the views of the majority, "the free-ship section is so hedged about with restrictions that little if any good would be accomplished by it." The value that the majority of the committee place on it may be judged by the following language in their report:

It is not believed that there will be a large demand for American register for foreign-built steamers under this provision.

Section 6, in all probability, will not add one single steamship to the fleet under the American flag engaged in the transoceanic commerce, upon either the Atlantic or Pacific. And, notwithstanding this frank admission, the majority report has the assurance to say to those who are opposed to subsidies that—this carefully guarded free-ship section will afford a test of the sincerity of those people in this country who have protested that they would support a measure for the upbuilding of the merchant marine, if some concession of a free-ship policy were associated with it.

It will be interesting to note how many will take this sugar-coated pill. In substance, H. R. 16362 is the same bill that was defeated in the second session of the Sixtieth Congress, with a free-ship veneer, to hide its ugliness. No one opposed to subsidies will be fooled or deceived by it.

The bill is regarded with much pride by its sponsors. They call it a new Declaration of Independence, and assure us that it will smash the impudent European ship trusts, but graciously omit to mention the Morgan shipping trust. To do so might offend the sensibilities of certain distinguished American owners of ships now under foreign flags, upon whom the Republican party will lean heavily for support and for campaign contributions in the coming congressional elections.

But other extravagant claims are made for this subsidy bill. It is claimed that it will add 20 to 40 American-built steamships of a tonnage of from 6,000 to 20,000, and of a speed of from 16 to 20 knots, that would serve as cruisers, transports, and supply ships in time of war, and the report makes the astounding statement; that "in the Pacific, as on the Atlantic, the new ocean mail routes would not benefit a single vessel now running." In complete refutation of that statement, both as to the new ships that would be built and the ships that would be available for the service, I shall here insert a table furnished by the Commissioner of Navigation.

List of steamship companies as given by the Commissioner of Navigation
March 9, 1910.
AMERICAN LINE.

Name of vessel.	Speed.	Gross tonnage.	Year built.
Philadelphia.....	20	10,786	1889
New York.....	20	10,798	1888
St. Louis.....	20	11,629	1895
St. Paul.....	20	11,629	1895

NEW YORK AND CUBA MAIL STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

Havana.....	18	6,391	1907
Morro Castle.....	18	6,004	1900
Saratoga.....	18	6,391	1907
Merida.....	17	6,207	1906
Mexico.....	17	6,207	1906

PACIFIC MAIL STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

Siberia.....	18	11,234	1901
Korea.....	18	11,276	1901
China.....	17	5,060	1889
Manchuria.....	16	13,639	1904
Mongolia.....	16	13,639	1904

OCEANIC STEAMSHIP COMPANY (SPRECKELS).

Sierra.....	17	5,980	1900
Sonoma.....	17	6,253	1900
Ventura.....	17	6,253	1900

MALLORY STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

Brazos.....	16½	6,223	1907
-------------	-----	-------	------

SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY.

Antilles.....	16	6,878	1907
Creole.....	16	6,387	1907

PACIFIC COAST STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

Governor.....	16	5,250	1907
President.....	16	5,218	1906

In my opinion, if this bill is enacted into law, it will add few, if any, ships to our merchant marine. On the other hand, the enormous bounties or subsidies it authorizes to be paid will go to ships already built—like the New York and Cuba Mail on the Atlantic, and the Pacific Mail, Oceanic, Southern Pacific, and Pacific Coast steamship companies on the Pacific.

Is not the miserable showing made in ships built under the ocean mail act of March 3, 1891, enough to convince us of the ineffectiveness of this measure to restore our merchant marine?

THE MINORITY SUBSTITUTE.

The minority of the committee have framed a substitute for the pending measure.

Section 1 of the substitute provides for a discriminating duty of 5 per cent of all custom duties on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States in vessels of the United States owned and controlled by citizens of the United States and, in connection with section 2, provides for the abrogation of treaties or commercial agreements with foreign countries in conflict with said section 1. In brief, we apply the principle of discriminating duties, under which our American merchant marine was built up, and under which 92 per cent of our commerce was carried in American ships under the American flag in 1826.

It would seem that this provision for discriminating duties should appeal strongly to our Republican brethren, in view of their declaration for discriminating duties in their platform in 1896. But in the light of subsequent history we have good reason to question the good faith of the declaration, as every bill reported since that time by the Republican majority in Congress has been for ship subsidies. It might be well here to remind some of my Democratic brethren that the policy of discriminating duties had the approval of Jefferson and Madison and other illustrious Democratic statesmen.

Section 3 of the minority substitute provides for free ships in the foreign trade, while section 4 provides that all material of foreign production that may be used in the construction or repair of vessels built in the United States and employed in the domestic as well as in the foreign trade, and all material necessary for the building or repair of their machinery and for their equipment may be imported free of duty into the United States.

These, in brief, are the features of the minority substitute.

That ships may be built in the American shipyards as cheaply as in the foreign, with the cooperation of the steel trust, is proven by the contract recently let to the Fore River Company to build two battle ships for Argentina. Mr. Schwab, of the steel trust, was one of the active agents in securing that contract. May we not reasonably expect that, if this Congress declares in favor of free ships and free ship material, the steel trust will make concessions to our American shipyards that will enable them to build ships as cheaply as they can be purchased abroad, and relieve this great industry from the handicap under which it is now laboring, and will not the 5 per cent discriminating duties provided for in the minority substitute compensate for the difference in cost of operating ships under the American and foreign flag? If not, it can be increased to 10 per cent.

Why not enact this substitute into law? If it does no good, it can not possibly do any harm. It can not hurt the American shipbuilding industry if American citizens should have the privilege of buying foreign ships and placing them under the American flag to use in the foreign trade, for our shipyards are not now building any ships for the foreign trade, but the repairs on these ships that would be overhauled in American shipyards would be of great profit to them.

On the other hand, if the effect will be, as the minority members of the committee confidently believe, to free American commerce and American shipbuilding from the monopolies and trusts built up and fostered by the protective tariff, who will have the boldness to say that that is not a consummation devoutly to be wished and prayed for?

If, as the distinguished Member from New York said, the protective tariff destroyed our American merchant marine, why not apply the obvious remedy and restore it?

WHAT HAVE SUBSIDIES DONE FOR OUR TRADE?

In order to clearly outline our foreign trade and to show how and where that trade has increased, I have prepared two tables, which I will not read, but ask to be printed as a part of my remarks.

It will be seen from these tables that our exports to Great Britain, with which we have the most heavily subsidized mail line, have increased but 25 per cent, while our exports to other countries in Europe, with which we have no subsidized line or lines, have increased 55 to 1,900 per cent.

We have no line to Canada, where our export trade has increased 181 per cent, while we have three or four subsidized lines, and have had them for fifteen years or more, to all the other North American countries, bringing increases from 36 to 150 per cent and a loss in two.

We have a subsidized line to Venezuela and Colombia, in both of which we have lost trade. We have no subsidized lines to other South American countries and have gained from 29 to 600 per cent.

We have gained more from Asia, where no subsidy has been paid for years, than from Australia, where a subsidy was paid for many years.

In imports we have lost ground in Venezuela, to which a subsidized line has gone for years, and gained immensely in all other South American countries, save Uruguay, to which no subsidized lines go.

We have gained more from the continent of Europe—a non-subsidized region—than from Great Britain, to which about \$800,000 per annum has been given for eighteen years as a mail subsidy.

We have made extensive commercial gains all over the world, being greater in almost every case with non-subsidized mail-line countries. Mail subsidy as a trade builder has been given a fair trial and has failed.

WHAT WE HAVE EXPENDED.

Twenty years will soon have elapsed since we began the policy of subsidizing for ocean mail service, during which we have had from six to eight contracts with steamship companies, at an average cost of about \$1,300,000 per annum. During the period 1901–1908, both inclusive, we paid out \$11,463,179, or an average of \$1,432,897 per annum. During the twenty-year period, at the very lowest estimate, we have paid out \$25,000,000, or enough to have built 50 ships of 5,000 tons and a speed of 16 knots per hour.

SUBSIDIES WILL NOT CREATE A MERCHANT MARINE.

We have paid out \$25,000,000 already and have not revived our American merchant marine. The present bill is an acknowledgment that mail subsidies have been failures as far as builders of a merchant marine.

Mr. Outerbridge, of the New York Chamber of Commerce, which voted down all forms of subsidy on December 17, 1909, said:

We are now paying the International American Marine Company (the Morgan Line) about \$739,000 a year for maintaining its weekly mail service with two American-built—the *St. Louis* and the *St. Paul*—and two English-built ships admitted to American registry without payment of duty—the *Paris* and the *New York*—* * * and there has certainly not been evidenced any desire or proposition to build additional ships. In proportion to their cost, speed, and quality, compared with the Cunard boats, the results of this payment—\$750,000 a year for ten or twelve years—would seem to be conclusive evidence that liberal mail subsidies will not improve our conditions in providing a mercantile marine.

Robert Dollar, a great shipowner on the Pacific coast, says of this, the Humphrey bill, "Shipping men generally look on it as a joke."

In 1891 we carried in American bottoms 12.5 per cent of our foreign trade; in 1909, after nineteen years of mail-subsidy payments, we carried 9.8 per cent of that trade.

It is therefore evident that liberal mail subsidies not only do not increase our trade, but do not build an American merchant marine.

I shall here insert a table prepared for me by Mr. Chamberlain, Commissioner of Navigation of the Department of Commerce and Labor, of date April 2, 1910, showing the steamships built under the ocean mail act of March 3, 1891. Could there be more convincing proof that subsidies will not build a merchant marine?

Steamships built under the ocean mail act of March 3, 1891.

Name.	Year built.	Gross tonnage.	Speed.	Owner.
			Knots.	
St. Louis.....	1895	11,629	20	International Merchant Marine Co.
St. Paul.....	1895	11,629	20	Do.
Admiral Dewey.....	1898	2,104	15	American Mail Steamship Co.
Admiral Farragut.....	1898	2,104	15	Do.
Admiral Schley.....	1898	2,104	15	Do.
Admiral Sampson.....	1898	2,262	15	Alaska Pacific Steamship Co.
Maracaibo.....	1899	1,771	12	Red "D" (Boulton, Bliss & Dallett).
Zulia.....	1901	1,713	12	Do.
Sonoma.....	1900	6,253	17	Oceanic Steamship Co.
Ventura.....	1900	6,253	17	Do.
Sierra.....	1900	5,969	17	Do.
Morro Castle.....	1900	6,004	18	New York and Cuba Mail.
Esperanza.....	1901	4,702	16	Do.
Monterey.....	1901	4,702	16	Do.
Merida.....	1906	6,207	17	Do.
Mexico.....	1906	6,207	17	Do.
Havana.....	1907	6,381	18	Do.
Saratoga.....	1907	6,381	18	Do.
Colon.....	1899	5,697	17	Isthmian Canal Commission.
Panama.....	1898	5,697	17	Do.
Total.....		105,749		

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,
Washington, April 2, 1910.

DEAR JUDGE ALEXANDER: Complying with your verbal request of a few days ago, I take pleasure in inclosing herewith a statement of steamships built under the ocean mail act of March 3, 1891.

If at any time I can serve you, please command me.

Respectfully,

E. T. CHAMBERLAIN,
Commissioner.

Hon. J. W. ALEXANDER,
House of Representatives.

BUT WE DO NOT SUBSIDIZE ENOUGH, THEY SAY.

I am confident that the answer to this will be that we have not paid enough. This demands consideration.

According to the report of the British postmaster-general, dated September 8, 1908, and printed in the Report of the Commissioner of Navigation for the United States for 1909, page 111, Great Britain paid the Cunard Line £151,210, or \$733,860, for weekly service between Liverpool and New York. For the same service we paid the Morgan Line for a much slower service \$737,016. In an exhibit which I shall file with my remarks it will appear that the entire mail-subsidy payment of Great Britain in 1907 for a service that belts the globe was but \$1,525,040. In the same year we paid for a most limited service \$1,332,364.

In 1908 England, under 25 contracts with vessels going everywhere on the globe, paid \$2,340,930, while we, under eight contracts with vessels going principally to England, Cuba, Mexico, Central America, and Venezuela, paid \$1,132,364. So that it is clear that we are paying more than Great Britain for ocean mail service.

In 1908 Great Britain paid £8,900, or \$45,254, to vessels carrying mail to Brazil and the River Plata, while the present bill, at \$4 per mile to Rio Janeiro, 4,778 miles, fortnightly, would take from the Treasury \$496,912, or eleven times as much. Great Britain in 1908 paid £203,640, or \$989,690, to mail vessels bound for Brindisi, Bombay, Shanghai, and Adelaide, while for the same service, at \$4 per mile, we would pay \$1,364,272. For us it would require a service of 6,954 miles to Australia and 6,160 miles to Canton.

The following are French mail rates:

	Per marine league.
Mediterranean service.....	\$2.51
Indo-Chinese service.....	5.98
Australian service.....	5.98
African West Coast service.....	3.86
New York service.....	11.66

There are 6,075 feet in a marine mile and 3 miles in a league.

HOLLAND.

Holland pays the Royal West India Mail \$560 per outward voyage from Amsterdam to Parimaribo and Curacao in South America. At \$2 per mile, the present rate, we may pay \$4,400 to Demerara, 2,200 miles, and the proposed rate, \$4, would authorize \$8,800 per voyage. Between Amsterdam and Batavia, East Indies, Holland pays \$960 per outward voyage. Under our present law an outward voyage to Batavia from San Francisco would cost at least \$12,000, and under the proposed bill it would run to \$24,000 per voyage.

Canada pays \$126,000 per annum for a weekly service to England, for which we pay \$737,000.

SUBSIDIES TO CUBA AND SOUTH AMERICA.

We are paying \$65,000 per annum for mail service to La Guayra, and \$45,800 for service to Maracaibo, and have lost trade with the countries in which they are located. Why pay two subsidies to these terminals so near together? We are paying \$72,000 a year for ocean mail service from New York to Cuba. Can this be justified? We are paying \$132,000 for ocean mail service from New York to Tuxpam and \$126,000 for service from New York and Philadelphia to Port Antonio. In all, for ocean service around the Gulf of Mexico, we are paying \$440,000, an amount not justifiable under the conditions which prevail.

HOW TO RESTORE OUR MERCHANT MARINE, THE GREAT QUESTION.

The question of how to restore the prestige of our American merchant marine has been the theme of vital interest to statesmen for a generation past, and we seemingly are no nearer a solution of the question now than we were thirty or forty years ago.

Time and again both the great political parties have declared in favor of it in their national platforms and much space has been given to its discussion in the newspapers and magazines. Many able speeches have been delivered on the subject in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States. The subject has been treated from every point of view, but more often academically.

The last utterances by the great political parties on the subject were in 1908. The plank in the Democratic national platform is as follows:

We denounce the ship-subsidy bill recently passed by the United States Senate as an iniquitous appropriation of public funds for private purposes and a wasteful, illogical, and useless attempt to overcome by subsidy the obstructions raised by Republican legislation to the growth and development of American commerce on the sea. We favor the up-building of a merchant marine without new and additional burdens upon the people and without bounties from the Public Treasury.

The plank in the Republican national platform of 1908 is as follows:

We adhere to the Republican doctrine of encouragement to American shipping and urge such legislation as will advance the merchant-

marine prestige of the country, so essential to the national defense, the enlargement of avenues of trade, and the industrial prosperity of our own people.

The Republican platform contains the luminous statement "we adhere to the Republican doctrine of encouragement to American shipping," but left the industry in the dark as to the form of that encouragement. In 1896, as I have shown, it declared in favor of discriminating duties. If the declaration had been entirely frank, it would have been in favor of ship subsidy or bounty out of the National Treasury, as all the legislation proposed by the Republican party has been that sort, and the pending measure, the Humphrey bill, is a fair sample of the rest, with this difference, it contains a free-ship provision, but the majority report filed with the bill has the frankness to state:

It is not believed that there will be a large demand for American registry of foreign-built steamers under this provision.

The President is more frank than the Republican platform. His utterance was after the election, the platform declaration before. In his message of December 7, 1909, he said:

I earnestly commend to Congress the consideration and passage of a ship-subsidy bill.

THIS BILL IS A SUBSIDY.

In the discussion of this question, it is too much to indulge the hope that those favoring the Humphrey bill will not obscure the issue and undertake to deceive the people by using the terms "and mail pay" as applied to that measure. It is a subsidy bill pure and simple. The purpose is to take many millions of dollars out of the National Treasury and put them in the pockets of shipowners, to foster private enterprise that otherwise can not be conducted save at a loss under existing handicaps, the tariff being the greatest.

There is no disagreement between the majority and minority parties in the House that the restoration of our merchant marine is desirable, and that the question how best to do so shall be solved without unnecessary delay. I accord to my political opponents on the Committee on Merchant Marine the same sincere and patriotic motives in the consideration of this question and in the legislation proposed as prompt the minority. While we differ radically as to the means to be employed, we have the same object in view. The prestige of our Nation, the extension of our foreign commerce and provision for adequate auxiliary cruisers, transports, supply ships, and colliers for our navy in time of war, the glory of our flag, all demand that something shall be done, and that speedily. As great as is the demand, as desirable as is the consummation of this great purpose, we had better fail of its accomplishment, however, than to fasten new burdens on our National Treasury, as I have tried to show when there is absolutely no reasonable promise of securing that result by enormous and useless expenditure of the people's money. I want the American people to understand what is proposed here by the majority, and when understood, I have faith that it will be condemned, not by special interests, not by those who profit by the Nation's bounty, but by the toiling masses of the American people who must shoulder this additional burden.

TONICS WILL NOT CREATE A MERCHANT MARINE.

At this point it may be well to call attention to a significant statement of Capt. A. T. Mahan, U. S. Navy, the most eminent naval writer of our time, in his work entitled "Influence of Sea Power upon History." Speaking of our naval power, he says:

Can this navy be had without resorting to merchant shipping? It is doubtful. History has proved that such a purely military sea power can be built up by a despot, as was done by Louis XIV, but though so fair-seeming, experience showed that his navy was like a growth which, having no root, soon withers away.

But in a representative government any military expenditure must have a strongly represented interest behind it, convinced of its necessity. How such shipping should be built up, whether by subsidies or free trade, by constant administration of tonics, or by free movement in the open air, is not a military but an economic question.

And the question is thus put up to us, as the representatives of the American people, to solve.

It is for us to determine "whether by subsidies or constant administration of tonics, or free trade, or by free movement in the open air" we will restore the American merchant marine. For my part I shall choose the latter policy. We have been applying tonics since 1891. More than \$25,000,000 have been expended by our Government in the way of tonics, and the result, so far as building up our merchant marine, has been negligible. I am in favor of free ships and discriminating duties. I would let in free of duty all the material used in ship construction and equipment of American ships, whether used in the foreign or coastwise trade. As between the American people and the steel trust, I take my stand with the people.

NO MORE PRIVILEGES FOR THE STEEL TRUST.

We must choose between a policy of ship subsidy in order that the steel trust and other trusts that control our shipbuilding industry may further enrich themselves at the expense of the shipbuilder and the shipowner, the navy, and the taxpayers of this Nation. I regard it to be my patriotic duty to adopt that policy which gives promise of relief from this iniquitous thralldom. I have no feeling of hostility toward any American industry. I want them all to flourish and prosper. I would have them earn generous dividends on this investment, but no more. In turn, I want them to show some regard for the general welfare. And when their greed becomes so inordinate that they will thwart all efforts to build up another great industry so necessary to our commercial prosperity as the restoration of our merchant marine, we should, so far as we may lawfully do so, loosen their hold on the throat of the Nation. What justification is there for the trusts to sell ship material to foreign shipbuilders cheaper than to our own shipyards? Why be so zealous to protect the steel trust when that industry is so unmindful of our shipbuilding industry? Will we ever wake up to the situation? What further need is there to protect the steel trust by high protective tariff duties? Did not Mr. Schwab and Mr. Carnegie testify before the House Committee on Ways and Means when the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was under consideration that the steel trust needs no further protection? And did not witnesses testify before the Merchant Marine Commission in 1905 that the trust sold steel plates from \$8 to \$10 a ton cheaper to foreign shipbuilders than to our own? Why should prices on ship plates regularly advance in the United States while regularly declining in Great Britain? Trust prices on ship plate here have advanced from \$28 a ton in 1900 to \$37 a ton in 1908, while free prices in England have declined from \$34 in 1900 to \$30.27 in 1908.

Edward I. Cramp, of the Cramp Shipbuilding Company, testified before the Merchant Marine Commission in May, 1904, that foreign shipbuilders were then paying about \$25 per ton for materials that cost the American shipbuilder \$40 per ton, a handicap against him of \$15 per ton.

Mr. James C. Wallace, of the American Shipbuilding Company, told the commission at Cleveland, Ohio, June 28, 1904, that the United States Steel Corporation was selling great quantities of shipbuilding material to foreign shipbuilders, delivered at Belfast at \$24 per ton, while the price charged at its Pittsburgh mills was \$32 per ton. Deducting \$2 for ocean transportation and \$1.40 for freight from Pittsburgh to tide water, the steel trust is selling steel to foreigners at \$20.60 per ton, the same steel that it sells to Americans at \$32 a ton.

Mr. Wallace estimated that an 8,000-ton ship would require about 3,500 tons of steel materials, and that the discrimination of \$8 per ton would make a difference of \$28,000 in the cost of the construction of the ship here and abroad.

Mr. George Wallace, superintendent of the Union Iron Works, the largest shipbuilding plant on the Pacific coast, stated to the commission at San Francisco that he was in a Scottish shipyard in 1900, where they were building a vessel almost exactly like one he was building in his yards, and he saw there materials unloaded from a ship from New York, furnished by Carnegie & Co. at about \$13 a ton less than he was paying for the same materials.

It is only fair to state that the Payne-Aldrich tariff law has made an important concession in favor of our domestic shipbuilders. It gives free material for ships for foreign ownership, or American ownership and to be used in the foreign trade; why not give the domestic shipbuilder free material for American ships, whether used in the foreign or domestic trade, as proposed by the minority substitute? Why further handicap this great and important industry?

OUR MILD MAIL SUBSIDIES NEARLY THE HIGHEST IN THE WORLD.

The New York Times, in an editorial entitled "Buying foreign trade," uses the following convincing argument against the plea for subsidies:

The main argument that we must subsidize shipbuilders to get foreign trade is the fruit of topsy-turvy reasoning. We might get ships if we had trade; we can not get and keep a big merchant marine if we haven't enough trade to employ it profitably.

Our friends, the advocates of subsidies, cite the example of other nations. Let us see. Great Britain pays for mail carrying and admiralty subvention—that is, for the right to take ships—some \$7,000,000 a year. She has a mercantile marine of about 18,000,000 tons, so that she pays less than 40 cents per ton.

We have a foreign mercantile marine of 930,000 tons, and pay, according to Mr. Dickie, of the Council of the Society of Naval Architects, about \$1,500,000, or a little over \$1.50 a ton.

Again, Germany has a mercantile marine of a little less than 4,000,000 tons, and pays \$3,000,000 a year, or 75 cents per ton, one-half of our rate.

Evidently it is not the German rates that do the trick. And then comes France, with the most reckless of all subsidy payments, and

squanders \$9,500,000 a year on a marine of 1,751,000 tons, or more than \$5 per ton.

So we have two great prosperous and growing merchant marines with average rates of government payments far lower than ours, and one feeble marine with a rate of payment more than three times that of our own.

The examples of other nations do not on these figures encourage us to throw our money away on subsidies. It does no better if we examine the records of progress. Great Britain, with nominal payments, has doubled its marine in a quarter of a century. Germany, with less than twice the rate of payments, has a little more than tripled hers. France, with a rate of payment twelvefold that of Great Britain, has not quite doubled hers. That of the United States has fallen off by about one-third.

THE EXAMPLE OF OTHER NATIONS.

It is common for those who advocate subsidies to point to the example of other marine nations, Japan and Germany being cited as conspicuous examples. We have already looked into the policy of Germany.

It may serve a useful purpose to look into the Japanese law of subsidies for transoceanic steamship lines. The subsidized lines are subject to many burdens or exactions. The following are some of them:

Passenger fares and freight charges are determined subject to the approval of the minister of state, and he may specify the kinds of passengers and cargo for which the charges are to be reduced. Vessels employed for subsidized navigation shall carry free of charge mail matter and articles for use in mail service, and shall make arrangements with reference to wireless telegraphy, and carry free of charge officers on communication business or inspection of steamship lines.

They are required to employ and keep on board at their own cost four to six students of navigation, according to the tonnage of the vessel.

The law provides that those who engage in subsidized navigation shall make statements of profit and loss, and the minister of state may cause officials to inspect their accounts and all matters relating to their business, and for that purpose require them to submit their books and other documents for inspection, and subsidized ships may be appropriated or employed for public purposes, at a compensation to be fixed by the minister of state.

Despite all this, the Japanese policy is not satisfactory to the Japanese. In the December, 1909, Monthly Consular and Trade Reports Vice-Consul Fuller says:

For the last ten years Japan has been spending large sums of money in the encouragement of her mercantile marine, and some doubt is being expressed as to the practical value to Japan of this policy and the results shown by the operation of the subsidized lines.

LACK OF SUBSIDY NO CAUSE FOR LACK OF TRADE.

It is by no means true that an insufficiency of subsidy or mail pay is responsible for our small trade in various parts of the world. In the American Review of Reviews for February, 1910, is a long article reviewing the article of William R. Shepherd in the Political Science Quarterly, which shows that other reasons are in the way—reasons that will destroy new trade no matter how great the subsidy. These reasons are, in short:

1. Indifference to the language, customs, needs, and economic conditions of the countries with which trade is sought.
2. Holding themselves superior in civilization to their customers and vaunting their superiority.
3. That the American way of doing business is the best in the world.
4. That American goods are the best in the world.

Our consular reports teem with reasons why we fail to reach customers in certain countries, and I have compiled several of these in a list, which, with the article from the Review of Reviews, I shall attach to my remarks as appendices.

I adduce one set as given by Consul Gracey, of China, in June, 1908:

1. American prices too high.
2. System of discounts not clear.
3. Rely too much on catalogues printed in English.
4. No drummers are sent.
5. Goods not made to suit local wants.
6. Too long to deliver.
7. System of credits not favorable.
8. Bad packing.

In the great multiplicity of real reasons it is unreasonable to pick out the least logical reason and make it the basis for legislation. We have gained an enormous trade in other countries with a better system of trade rules, and can have it wherever we desire by going after it in the right way.

FALSE ASSUMPTIONS.

Newspaper articles are numerous just now of actions by boards of trade demanding the passage of the Humphrey bill. A careful reading of these articles will convince any careful man that these associations have been misled as to the exact import of the Humphrey bill. In nearly every case the idea predominates that a mail subsidy is a cargo subsidy; that a

payment for carrying the mails will enure to small vessels that carry cargoes. Nothing is further from the truth.

The Commissioner of Navigation in a letter dated March 9, 1910, directed to me, gives 22 vessels of over 5,000 tons and 16 knots now under American registry—the only steamships likely to be affected by this legislation. I shall append this list as an exhibit to my remarks.

Of the ships launched in British shipyards in 1907, being 886 in all, 825 were under 5,000 tons burden and 59 over 5,000 tons. In a list already referred to in these remarks, it has been shown that in a total of 14,626 merchant vessels in the British service, less than 300 are subsidized in any way—or less than 5 per cent.

FREE MANNING.

The fact that we have lately secured the contract for building war ships for Argentina proves that American shipyards can build war ships as cheap as any country. Admiral Bowles shouted this truth to his hearers in Massachusetts when he exultantly announced his success. If we can build war ships as cheap as others, why can we not build merchant vessels as cheaply, if we can have the cooperation of the steel trust as did the Fore River Company in bidding for the battle ships for Argentina?

THE FOREIGNER IN AMERICA.

The *Finland* and *Kroonland* were transferred to a foreign flag to evade our navigation laws, which interfere at every point with private management and direction by shipowners. Our ships to fly the American flag and receive the subsidy must be American manned, if the law is enforced. Does the Aldrich-Payne bill limit its privileges to manufacturers who employ American labor? Are the employers on land, in order to have high-tariff rates, required to man their shops with American labor? Nay, verily. Cheap foreign labor under high Republican tariffs competes by invitation with American-born citizens in every factory and shop on the shore. Why lay the heavy hand of inhibition on the shipowner on the high seas trying to carry the American flag to every foreign port by requiring his ship to be American manned, and permit every landlubber to hire all the foreigners he needs?

Nor is it always true that foreign seamen receive less than ours. The President of the Seamen's Union of America testified before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on February 24, 1910, that there was absolutely no difference between the wages paid seamen on American vessels and wages paid seamen on foreign vessels. But admitting a difference, why should American shipowners be debarred from the privilege accorded manufacturers on land—that of choosing his own workmen irrespective of their nationality?

Mr. HARDY. Was it not shown in the hearings before the Merchant Marine Committee that our coastwise and lake ship owners employ a large per cent of foreign labor notwithstanding they are given an absolute monopoly of that trade?

Mr. ALEXANDER of Missouri. Yes; it was. In 1900 there were, according to the census, 10,356,644 foreign-born population in the United States. Since then we have admitted 7,703,816 foreigners, making a total to-day of 18,060,460 foreigners in a total population of 86,000,000.

WHAT FOREIGNERS MAY DO ON LAND.

No restrictions are thrown round the legally admitted emigrant. He seeks and may obtain employment where he will; he may underbid the native worker, and does underbid him; factories use him to break the strikes of native labor and to keep the normal rate of wages as low as possible; he is not required to naturalize himself and fly the American flag over his head in order to compete with American-born citizens; he is entitled to a "square deal" and a "fair show" whenever and wherever trusts and protected interests need his services to batter down the higher wages demanded by Americans, who live in greater comfort than any workmen in the world.

If trusts and monopolies may use foreign labor almost unrestrictedly to enlarge their profits, why should not American shipowners have the same privilege—in a higher purpose—the making of a greater American merchant marine?

In 1900 there were 21,329,819 males of voting age in the United States, of whom 5,102,534 were foreign born, or nearly 25 per cent. According to Gen. Francis A. Walker these have—amounted not to a reinforcement of our population, but to replacement of native by foreign stock. That if the foreigners had not come, the native element would long since have filled the places the foreigners usurped. (Discussions in Economics and Statistics, vol. 2, p. 422.)

If we are so tenderly respectful to the principle of foreign competition in industrial matters at home—where the interests of 29,000,000 workers are affected—why be so harsh when the manning of ships is concerned, an industry employing less than

100,000 souls and to which an American will not go unless shanghaied?

American labor is hurt by foreigners in the home field; but why pursue a less liberal policy when we are trying to restore our merchant marine? Get the ships first. Build an American marine, and the labor question will adjust itself to reasonable conditions, out of which will grow American manning when a seafaring life becomes more attractive to Americans.

In 1900 we had 1,086,439 foreign whites who could neither read nor write competing with natives for jobs and lowering the American wage scale. We had 623,298 souls who could speak no English, all free to place themselves anywhere they could at wages to be determined by tariff-protected operators of mills and factories.

In 1900 there were 26,198,939 persons having one or both parents born abroad, of which 21,074,679 had both father and mother of foreign birth.

Of the 5,102,534 foreign-born voting population of 1900 over 12 per cent were illiterate. These illiterates can work under the American flag on land, but not at sea, under the Humphrey bill.

AMERICAN EMPLOYERS ON LAND HAVE THE RIGHT TO EMPLOY WHOM THEY PLEASE, AND DO SO.

Why should shipowners be subject to another rule?

There is no reason for the free entry of foreign workmen into the country to be freely employed by all employers under the flag which does not apply with equal force to labor employers on the sea. Not only is this so, but it might with propriety be argued that a greater latitude should be permitted shipowners than other labor employers on the land. Shipowners must compete on the sea with all character of ships and all character of manning. The greater the freedom the more certain the result. The freedom on shore is absolute to every employer; let the same freedom extend to the sea.

FOREIGN LABOR LEAVES ITS NATIVE LAND—

1. From primary necessity;
2. To escape military service and other burdens;
3. To become self-supporting.

It seeks employment on its own terms, and few restrictions are placed in its way on land to retard its chance or to make unfair its deal. The same reasons impel labor to seek employment on ships, and it should have the same opportunity there as is given it on land. It is poorly paid labor, but not pauper labor. It is an insult to labor to call the low-priced part pauper labor. The great work of the world in its entirety is made possible from the fact that the average price of all labor is less than \$1.50 a day. The number of employees engaged in manufacturing in the United States in 1905 was 5,470,000, and the total wages paid \$2,611,540,000, or \$477 a year. Allowing three hundred and thirteen days to the year, this would be \$1.52 a day; taking three hundred and sixty-five days, the rate is \$1.30 a day.

I have presented these figures to show that foreign labor is coming in sharp competition with American labor in our protected industries, and yet it is claimed with much force and eloquence by subsidy advocates that the law of March 3, 1891, and the Humphrey bill require American subsidized ships to be manned in large part by American citizens, receiving American wages, and hence the need for subsidies to enable them to compete with foreign ships; also that American ships receiving subsidy will be required to carry a certain number of naval apprentices, or cadets, according to the tonnage of the vessel.

While the law of March 3, 1891, does provide that vessels employed in the mail service under said act shall be officered by American citizens, and upon each departure from the United States the following proportion of the crews shall be citizens of the United States, to wit: During the first two years the said contract for carrying the mails, one-fourth thereof; during the next three succeeding years, one-third thereof; and during the remaining time of the continuance of such contract, at least one-half thereof; yet we are told that in practice said law is a dead letter. A representative of the American Steamship Association, in statements before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in April last, said: "The American sailor is an extinct bird; we have very few of them here;" that less than 10 per cent of the crew, excluding licensed officers, are American citizens, and most of the officers are naturalized, not native born; that the crews for the most part are Portuguese, Spanish, and Italian, and that this is true of the crews of the *St. Louis*, *St. Paul*, *New York*, and *Philadelphia*, all receiving subsidies under act of March 3, 1891, as well as other ships under the American flag. Another reason urged for subsidies is that our navigation laws require better food and better

quarters for American sailors than are required by the navigation laws of foreign countries.

It may be a disappointment to honest advocates of subsidies of American ships to know that this is not correct. The food scale required by our navigation laws is no better than that required by the navigation laws of England, Germany, and France; while the space for each seaman on merchant ships of those nations is 120 feet, as against 72 feet on American vessels. The seamen's bill, known as the Spight bill, now pending before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, seeks to ameliorate the condition of American seamen in this and other respects.

It is bitterly opposed by the shipping interests, who claim that if enacted into law it will add further and great burdens to the existing handicaps of the American merchant marine. The minority of the committee fully realizes the many difficulties that must be overcome if we can hope to restore our merchant marine. We have tried to point out some of them. There are many obstacles that can not be remedied by legislation. The seafaring life seems no longer to attract the American youth. They can find more profitable and congenial employment on land, and so it may be said of American capital that it finds more profitable investment in other fields.

While the substitute for the Humphrey bill may not accomplish the desired result in restoring our American merchant marine, we feel sure that it is a step in the right direction. When the time comes that the American shipowner may buy and navigate his ships on the same terms and under the same conditions as his foreign rival, then and not until then will American cargoes be carried in American bottoms and the American flag float proudly at the masthead of the American ships and be seen in all the ports of the world. [Applause.]

EXHIBIT A.

[Extracts from the hearings before the Merchant Marine Commission in 1904.]

The officers of the Home Market Club in 1903 submitted a circular to various parts of the country asking answers to the following questions:

1. Should there be a revival of discriminating duties and other regulations of commerce?
2. Should subsidies be paid?

Only 703 replies were received, but they came from all parts of the country. Four hundred and fifty-six favored duties and regulations, 132 favored subsidies, 86 favored both, 29 were opposed to either; and this proportion ran very evenly through the different sections of the country.

In New England 256 favored duties and regulations, 62 subsidies, 55 both, 6 neither.

In the Middle States 73 favored duties and regulations, 30 subsidies, 8 both, 7 neither.

In the South 63 favored duties and regulations, 19 subsidies, 15 both, 9 neither.

In the West 53 favored duties and regulations, 13 subsidies, 6 both, 6 neither.

On the Pacific coast 11 favored duties and regulations, 8 subsidies, 2 both, 1 neither.

Calvin B. Orcutt, president of the Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company, said:

There is a difference of about 40 per cent in the cost of shipbuilding materials to American builders on account of the tariff (p. 40).

He afterwards, by calculation, raised this to 43 per cent.

Special committee of the Maritime Association of the port of New York said:

We think that the laws should be so amended and the treaties so changed, or, if necessary, abrogated, as to permit the reapplication of the policy of discriminating duties on imports and discriminating duties on tonnage, so as to restore that portion of the trade of the United States to American vessels that is now carried on in vessels coming from ports not their own, in ballast or with cargoes for the United States, or seeking to secure cargoes from the United States to ports other than those of the country whose flag they fly (p. 140).

This committee thought that the early effect of this policy would be to give to American vessels practically the entire carriage of the commerce between the United States and the West Indies, Central and South America, a considerable portion of Asia, and many of the islands of the sea (p. 140).

Mr. W. W. Bates, former Commissioner of Navigation, said:

It has been shown that the method of the Constitution (discriminating duties and tonnage taxes) costs the country nothing, being simply the regulation of our commerce defensively. Some good people affect disapproval of this, because its success in our early history created enemies. We should avoid displeasure and save trouble, say they, by adopting a subsidy policy. This is illogical. We can not resume our carrying trade by any means pleasing to foreign nations. Besides, this

suggestion is impractical for the United States: First, because it is not constitutional—no single trade can be subsidized without violating the rights of all the other trades; second, because the Constitution provides a specific power for Congress to exercise for ship protection; third, because the principle of subsidy is not well adapted to nine-tenths of the work to be done; fourth, because, if adopted and successful, the people—the real rulers of this country—would not tax themselves year after year for the tens, scores, and hundreds of millions of expenditure (p. 267).

Mr. Pendleton, president Atlantic Carriers' Association, said:

I believe in the method of discriminating duties and tonnage taxes, because it creates a preference for American bottoms in the mind of the importer and shipper and thereby insures continuous employment for the vessel (p. 149).

He thought that the policy would give us the entire South American trade.

Mr. James J. Hill said:

If you admit foreign-built ships free of duty you will get a merchant marine quicker than you will in any other way (p. 170).

Again he said:

Unless there is an American demand for the building of an American merchant marine I do not see how you can build it up. My proposition is to give an export bounty, although differential duties would bring about the same thing (p. 172).

Mr. Wallace Downey, president of the Townsend-Downey Shipbuilding Company, said:

The cost of construction should be made up by a direct bounty of so much per ton for the construction of the vessel.

As to difference in operation, the most direct and equitable method would be export bounties upon goods exported in American bottoms. The easier and most popular method I believe to be that of differential duties. I think it would be successful, but open to the probability of retaliation (p. 189).

Mr. Crowell, commerce expert, Bureau of Commerce and Labor, and lecturer on international trade, Columbian University, said:

It would seem to me to be a much more practicable way to regard the business of opening ocean lines as a mere extension of our railway lines and to provide that such ships should be admitted free as were necessary to gain command of the leading trade lines between our own and those of the world's markets. It may be necessary to do this for a period of ten or fifteen years (p. 198).

Mr. Edwin S. Cramp, vice-president of the Cramp Shipbuilding Company, said:

To compensate for the omissions of the past I would suggest:

1. That Congress should pass an act similar to the one introduced by Senator LODGE in December, 1903. The increase in shipbuilding and shipowning that would follow the enactment of such a law would be so great that it would test the full capacities of the constructive establishments as well as the efficiency and capabilities of the personnel in the shipowning line.

The CHAIRMAN. In a word, state what that bill contemplates.

Mr. CRAMP. Indirect discriminating duties.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose you are aware of the fact that there are some thirty-odd treaties in the way of legislation of that kind?

Mr. CRAMP. I know there is an awful lot of trouble in anything you may want to do in this world.

2. An increase in the postal compensation of at least 50 per cent.

3. A specific rate for vessels of not less than 15,000 tons, having a speed of not less than 22 knots (pp. 425-426).

Mr. A. B. Johnson, partner in the Baldwin Locomotive Works, said:

There are three methods which I should advocate to the restoration of our shipping:

1. An abundant compensation for carrying the mails, graded according to speed.

2. A moderate tonnage, payable on the outward voyage only.

3. A moderate reduction of the duties on goods imported in American bottoms.

We have built around us a tariff higher than we actually need for protection (p. 307).

Mr. D. C. May, president of the New York Shipbuilding Company, said:

I am in favor of a bounty per ton-mile to American shipping. I rather think it would be a matter of considerable difficulty to get the money to pay the bounty, and in consequence of that my next choice would be the scheme of the Maritime Association of New York, which has been put before the commission—that is, the differential duty and tonnage scheme. I think that is the most practicable scheme I know of. There are difficulties in the way of treaties and quite a number of others; but I believe it can be done, and while it is not quite choice, I think it is the most practicable scheme yet presented (p. 324).

Mr. May has one of the best-equipped yards in America.

Mr. F. W. Taylor, operating a line of chartered steamers between Philadelphia and London, said:

Personally I do not see any way of arriving at a solution of the problem at the present time unless you will allow us to buy steamers in the cheapest market and change our navigation laws to enable us to operate them in competition with foreigners (p. 335).

Mr. Sans, in the shipping business in Philadelphia since 1814, said:

I suggest that our navigation laws be abolished and thereby open the markets of the world to our citizens (p. 389).

Mr. Edwin S. Cramp said:

I really believe that discriminating duties would be of more lasting benefit.

Representative SPRIGHT. More permanent?

Mr. CRAMP. More permanent.

Representative SPRIGHT. I think so, too.

Mr. CRAMP. They might give a slower growth to the lines, but it would be more permanent (p. 430).

Mr. Charles Platt, of Philadelphia, said:

Amend the navigation laws so as to enable American citizens to build or purchase ships in the cheapest market, an equitable duty of not exceeding 10 per cent on the cost to be imposed by the United States Government. Another remedy would be such a modification of the tariff as would produce ample revenue without undue protection to any one interest (p. 435).

Mr. C. Morton Stewart, of a shipping firm that has been sailing vessels since 1840, said:

The matter of primary importance is free ships, absolutely and unequivocally, and preferential duties. I am ready to run steamers; I am ready to own them, but I will only own them if I can buy them as cheaply as my competitors (p. 487).

Mr. Joseph R. Foard, president Board of Trade, Baltimore, Md., and a shipper and importer all his life, said:

I have been a lifelong advocate of free ships as a safe and sure remedy, accompanied by changes of our navigation laws. I do not believe that differential duties will furnish a remedy which would satisfy capital. A general subsidy I believe to be impossible, impracticable, and the most expensive aid that human ingenuity could devise. I also recommend liberal mail contracts (pp. 501-503).

Colonel Clarke, of Boston, Mass., secretary of the Home Market Club, said:

I think that Mr. Winsor has said this morning that direct mail subsidies for regular lines may be the speediest and most effective cure for the evils that exist, and I think discriminating duties and other regulations of commerce for the indirect trade would be desirable, if they would not cause troublesome foreign complications, owing to the commercial agreements that exist between this Government and 21 or 22 foreign governments, but as all those treaties are terminable by their express language within one year, of course it would be competent for our Government to denounce those treaties at any time when its own interests might seem to require. I do not think foreign governments could object to any course which this Government might seem to pursue for the protection and advancement of the interest of this country (p. 561).

Mr. Edwin F. Atkins, Boston, Mass., former owner of ships, now importer and exporter, said:

We might make a reduction in our high tariff. In the steel schedules to begin with, and in other articles entering into the shipbuilding business.

Mr. Atkins gave the following conversation between himself and one of the largest machinery manufacturers of Europe concerning the Chamberlain policy. This gentleman said that while theoretically he favored the policy of a discriminating duty against foreign goods, practically he was opposed to it, for, as he said:

Mr. Atkins, as long as I can buy my material in the United States cheaper, by many dollars per ton than your own manufacturers can get it, I can sell machinery to Cuba; I can sell machinery to all the South American States and British Colonies at far below the cost of any of your manufacturers (p. 567).

Mr. Atkins further said:

Yes; you can now get a drawback from the United States Steel Corporation of \$5 a ton on all goods that enter into manufactures to be exported.

Senator MALLORY. Do you know whether that covers steel plates to shipbuilding?

Mr. ATKINS. It does; all materials; and if \$5 is not enough, you can probably get more. Now, as long as the Englishman can build under those conditions they are going to take advantage of it, and I see no way of competing (p. 569).

Mr. Augustus P. Loring, Boston, Mass., president Plymouth Cordage Company, shipowner, said:

A drawback in the shape of a rebate of duties would do more, to my mind, than a subsidy would to encourage commerce, because it would encourage commerce not only in liners but in small tramp steamers or large tramp steamers, which have no fixed route, if they could be carried more cheaply in them than in foreign vessels. Personally, I should like to see a rebate of duties on all goods imported in American vessels, and I should like to see something done, either to protect the American shipyard and equalize the cost of building a ship there, or else give an opportunity to buy ships where we can buy them the cheapest (p. 633).

Mr. Edwin M. Brower, engaged in shipping business all his life, and his father before him, said:

I disapprove entirely of the proposition for giving general subsidies to our shipowners and for discriminating against imports by foreign vessels. I favor the giving our citizens the right to purchase foreign-built vessels and registering them under our flag * * * a privilege which the citizens of all other nations enjoy (p. 645).

Mr. Howes, formerly an officer of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, said:

He was opposed to discriminating duties and also to a subsidy. He said: "I believe that the free-ship plan would work out in the end a better result than the other. Free ships to receive no subsidy and a subsidy to American-built ships would be the best method" (p. 651 et seq.).

Mr. W. W. Bates, former Commissioner of Navigation, gives the following as our shipping experience:

Tonnage and comparative carriage in foreign trade before and after reciprocity agreements.

[By W. W. Bates, former Commissioner of Navigation.]

No.	Country.	Convention.		Foreign trade shipping.	Proportion of our carriage in foreign trade.	
		Date of effect.	Time of term.		Imports.	Exports.
BEFORE ADOPTION OF RECIPROCIDITY.						
		1789	Years.	Tons.	Per cent.	Per cent.
		1790	-----	123,893	17.8	30
		1791	-----	346,254	41	40
		1791	-----	363,110	58	52
		1792	-----	411,438	67	61
		1793	-----	367,734	82	67
		1794	-----	438,863	91	85
		1795	-----	529,471	92	88
		1796	-----	576,733	94	90
		1797	-----	597,777	92	88
		1798	-----	603,376	91	87
		1799	-----	657,142	90	87
		1800	-----	657,107	91	87
		1801	-----	630,558	91	88
		1802	-----	557,760	88	85
		1803	-----	585,910	89	83
		1804	-----	660,514	91	86
		1805	-----	744,224	93	89
		1806	-----	798,567	93	89
		1807	-----	810,163	94	90
		1808	-----	765,252	93	88
		1809	-----	906,855	88	84
		1810	-----	981,019	93	90
		1811	-----	763,607	90	86
		1812	-----	758,636	85	80
		1813	-----	672,700	71	65
		1814	-----	674,633	58	51
PARTIAL RECIPROCIDITY.						
1	Great Britain, July ^a	1815	4	854,295	77	71
	Netherlands (act).....	1816		800,700	73	68
		1817	9	804,851	79	74
2	Sweden and Norway, Sep- tember ^a	1818	8	589,954	85	80
	Great Britain ^c	1818	10			
		1819				
		1820				
		1821		581,280	87	82
		1820		583,657	90	89
		1821		593,825	92.7	84.9
3	France, October ^c	1822	2	582,701	92.4	84.1
		1823		600,003	92.1	87.4
		1824		636,807	93.4	88.7
		1825		665,409	95.2	89.2
4	Denmark, April ^f	1826	10	606,221	95	89.6
5	Central America, August ^h	1826	12			
6	Hanseatic Republics, Decem- ber ^h	1827	12	701,517	94.3	87.5
	Sweden and Norway, Jan- uary ^c	1828	10	757,998	91.4	84.5
	Great Britain, October ^c	1828	(b)			
		1828	(d)			
7	Brazil, December ^f	1828	12	592,850	93	86
8	Prussia, March ^c	1829	12			
FULL RECIPROCIDITY.						
	British North American colonies (act), October.....	1830	(b)	537,563	93.6	86.3
9	Austria-Hungary, Febru- ary ^c	1831	10	533,136	91	80.6
10	Mexico, April ⁱ	1832	8	614,121	89.4	75.8
11	Russia, May ^c	1833	6	648,869	90.7	75.8
		1834		749,378	89	74.5
		1835		788,173	90.2	77.3
12	Venezuela, May ^f	1836	12	753,094	90	75
		1837		683,205	86	77
13	Greece, June ^c	1838	10	702,962	90	82
14	Sardinia, March ^h	1839	10	702,400	88	78
15	Netherlands, July ^c	1839	10			
16	Hanover, May ^c	1840	12			
17	Portugal, August ^f	1840	6	762,838	86.6	79.9
		1841		788,308	88	77
18	Ecuador, April ^f	1842	12	823,740	88	76
		1843		856,930	77	77
		1844		900,471	86	70
19	Two Sicilies, December ^a	1845	10	904,476	87	75
20	Belgium, March ^f	1846	10	943,307	87	76
	Hanover, June ^h	1846	12			
	Oldenburg, March ^h	1847	12			
21	Oldenburg, March ^h	1847	12	1,047,454	77	65
22	Mecklenburg-Schwerin, De- cember ^h	1847	10			
	Mexico, May ^m	1848	8			
23	New Grenada, June ^h	1848	20	1,168,707	82	71
		1849		1,258,756	81	68
24	Hawaiian Islands, August ^h	1850	10	1,439,694	77	65
		1851		1,544,663	75	69
25	Guatemala, May ^f	1852	12	1,705,650	74.5	66.5
26	Costa Rica, May ^f	1852	7			
27	Salvador, June ^a	1852	20			
28	Peru, July ^f	1852	10			
	Netherlands, February ^c	1853	2	1,916,471	71.5	67
29	Argentine Republic, Decem- ber ^c	1854	(n)	2,151,918	71	69
		1855		2,348,358	77	73

Tonnage and comparative carriage in foreign trade, etc.—Continued.

No.	Country.	Convention.		Foreign trade shipping.	Proportion of our carriage in foreign trade.	
		Date of effect.	Time of term.		Imports.	Exports.
FULL RECIPROCIDITY—continued.						
	Two Sicilies, November ^a	1856	Years. 10	Tons. 2,302,190	Per cent. 78	Per cent. 70
		1857		2,268,196	71	60
	Denmark, January ^c	1858	(b) 10	2,301,148	72	75
	Belgium, April ^f	1859	10	2,321,674	63.7	69.9
30	Paraguay, March ^c	1860	10	2,379,396	63	69.7
31	Ottoman Porte, June ^f	1862	28	2,173,537	44.8	54.5
	Venezuela, August ^f	1862	10			
32	Bolivia, November ^c	1861	8	2,494,894	65	72
33	Liberia, February ^c	1863	(n) 8	1,926,886	43	40
		1864		1,486,749	24.6	30
34	Honduras, May ^c	1865	7	1,518,350	29.9	26
35	Haiti, May.....	1866	8	1,387,756	25	37.7
36	Dominican Republic, October ^f	1867	8	1,515,648	28	39
37	Nicaragua, June.....	1868	15			
38	Madagascar, July ^a	1868	(n) 10	1,494,389	33	36.6
		1869		1,496,220	31	34.9
		1870		1,448,846	33	37.7
39	Italy, November ^c	1871	5	1,333,652	31	23.6
		1872		1,359,040	26.8	29.8
		1873		1,378,583	27	25.7
	Salvador, March ^f	1874	10			
	Peru, May ^f	1874	10	1,389,815	30	24.6
	Belgium, June ^c	1875	10	1,515,598	29	23.7
		1876		1,553,705	30.8	25
		1877		1,570,600	31.5	23.7
		1878		1,589,348	32	22.6
		1879		1,451,505	31.6	17.6
		1880		1,314,402	22	13.7
		1881		1,297,085	19.9	13
40	Korea, May ^c	1882	(n) 10	1,259,492	19	12.8
	Madagascar, March ^a	1883	(n) 10	1,260,681	20.7	13
		1884		1,276,972	22	14
		1885		1,265,814	21	13.7
41	Spain (Islands), October ^f	1886	(n) 10	988,041	20	13.6
	Spain (agreement), September ⁱ	1887	(n) 10	989,412	18.6	12
	Peru, October ^f	1888		919,302	18.5	11.79
		1889		999,619	17	11.62
		1890		928,062	16.08	9
		1891		988,719	15.85	9.25
		1892		977,024	17.66	8.11
		1893		883,199	15.45	8.79
		1894		899,698	19.43	8.74
		1895		822,347	15.49	8.22
		1896		829,833	15.76	8.57
		1897		792,870	14.97	8.10
	Spain (Philippines), December.....	1898	10	726,213	15.97	5.87
42	Japan, July ^c	1899	12	837,229	12.36	6.87
		1900		816,795	12.94	7.07
		1901		879,595	11.99	6.12
		1902		873,235	12.06	6.64
		1903		879,265	12.88	7.14

^a Superseded by later treaty or convention.

^b Term is indefinite, but terminable after one year's notice.

^c Countries we now have agreements with.

^d Convention at first protective on both sides; became nonprotective in 1828; terminable after six months' notice.

^e Banner years of American carriage in either exports or imports.

^f Terminated by foreign country giving notice.

^g Continuable by its own terms; terminable on one year's notice.

^h Merged into another country.

ⁱ As to reciprocity articles only.

^j Extension or renewal of term.

^k By act of Congress; repealable.

^l Terminated by war.

^m Abrogated by treaty, 1853.

ⁿ No term stated.

^o Banner year of American foreign-trade shipping.

^p To be revised, if desired, after five years.

Mr. James A. Patten, Chicago, Ill., one of the largest handlers of grain in America or in the world, said:

I do not believe that aid from the Government will assist exports from this country to any European port, because the tonnage now running from America to European ports is excessive. It looks to me that if it is the intention to give a subsidy to vessels running to every country in the world, you will have to keep it up forever (p. 715).

Mr. W. J. Sickie, Chicago, Ill., western freight agent of the International Mercantile Marine, the holding company for the White Star, the Atlantic Transport, the American, the Red Star, the Dominion, and the Leyland lines; also the agent for the Hamburg-American German Line.

Mr. Sickie stated that there was more tonnage now to export trade than was needed; that shippers always took the cheapest boats irrespective of the flag; that while there was a sentiment in favor of the American flag on ships the American people were against a subsidy. We used to bring back full cargoes of tin from the Bristol Channel, but your tariff has killed that

business. If you simply want to fly the flag, there is no alternative but to pay a subsidy; if you look at it from the standpoint of whether we have the necessary facilities to get our cargoes to foreign ports, I say we do not need any more steamers. We have too many of them now. Mr. Patten has stated truly that grain has been carried to Europe free, or even for less than nothing. If Great Britain pays \$6,000,000 annually for subventions and you distribute it over the British tonnage, it would amount to very little per vessel (pp. 723 et seq.).

Mr. A. C. Passano, of Detroit, Mich., president of the Great Lakes Engineering Works:

I favor preferential duties (p. 755).

Capt. J. M. McGregor, president of the International Pilots' Association:

We do not require a subsidy to encourage shipbuilding so much as we do a reduction in the price of raw materials used in shipbuilding (p. 785).

Again:

The steel trust sold 40,000 tons of steel rails to the Canadian Pacific for \$21.50, but would not sell them at home for less than \$28 or \$30. I want more ships built. I want our people to have the raw material at a reduced rate if the trust can afford to sell it to the foreigner at a reduced rate (p. 783).

Mr. James C. Wallace, Cleveland, Ohio, of the American Ship Building Company, said:

I can not quite agree with Mr. Goulder in his statement that anything you might do in the shape of subsidy will help American shipbuilders. Unless it is a very heavy subsidy, it will not, under existing conditions, help them to any great extent, for this reason: Recently one of our largest steel mills sold abroad 100,000 tons of steel plate. They delivered it at Belfast at \$24 a ton, or \$22 a ton at tide water. They are charging us to-day at Pittsburgh \$32 a ton. A differential of \$10 in a ship carrying 5,000 tons is \$50,000. That is the shipbuilder's profit (p. 811).

Mr. Thomas C. Fitzsimmons, president of the Finished Steel Company, of Youngstown and Cleveland, Ohio, said:

I am here as an American citizen. I am opposed to all forms of subsidy. If we have any business in this country that can not stand on its merits with a fair field and no favor, then let it die (p. 874).

Mr. Thomas S. Burley, Tacoma, Wash., manager of the Tacoma Tug and Barge Company:

Suppose we were to allow the American shipowner to go into the open market, buy or build any American vessel he may desire, and, say, for a period of one year, grant them American registry; we will then have a nucleus of a fleet to start with, and trades and routes will be found and worked up which will keep more shipyards than we have at present busy to supply new ships and to keep in repair the old ones (p. 1093).

Mr. J. E. Laidlaw, ship broker, Portland, Oreg.:

I am in favor of subsidies where something is returned for them; where a ship is carrying the mail she is entitled to payment for it; if held in reserve as a cruiser, she should receive a subsidy; but in the ordinary carrying trade she is not entitled to it. Free ships might not do any good, neither would they do any harm; so if a man wishes to invest money in a ship, let him do so. I know that if free ships were permitted, there would be a great deal of money invested in them and a great many fine ships brought under the flag of the United States (p. 1125).

Mr. George Taylor, Portland, Oreg.:

I believe in the free ship and in a mail subvention in liners (p. 1174).

Mr. James Rolph, San Francisco, Cal., president Shipowners' Association, Pacific coast:

Why should not American citizens be encouraged to purchase foreign-built ships, and why deny them the privilege of purchasing foreign vessels if they care to buy them at their own price, registering them under the American flag? Why deny the American owners of over some \$100,000,000 which they have invested in foreign tonnage and registered abroad the opportunity of placing it under the American flag? If they will consent to do this with the proviso that they be debarred from the coasting privileges and from any right to participate in any subsidy or differential duty paid to American ships. You may ask what benefit they will derive from this? Possession of their own property and protection to it. Foreign governments which have the largest fleets of merchant ships allow their subjects to do this. This is the only country in the world where it can not be done (p. 1183).

Again:

A few years ago I was more in favor of a subsidy than I am at the present time. I am strongly in favor of a reduction of import duties on all cargo imported in American-built vessels (p. 1188).

Mr. W. C. Tibbetts, manager Pacific Shipping Company, San Francisco, Cal.:

Taxes should be abolished; American vessels carrying United States mail should be given subsidies equal to that given by any other nation; a shipbuilding bounty would be of no service, and I do not believe in a mileage bounty. I would suggest a tonnage tax on all vessels receiving bounties from their home governments equal to the bounty paid (p. 1294).

Mr. I. E. Thayer, marine surveyor and shipbuilder, San Francisco, Cal.:

It has been acknowledged in the shipping papers of Great Britain for the last twenty years that Germany was their best customer for ships; that next to British subjects Germany takes more of their ships than any other nation. Taking the generally accepted American view of this business, the result attained would be the total destruction of the home

shipbuilding yards and industry. But that was not the result. The statistics clearly show the reverse. Beginning with the year 1868, 7 German yards turned out 42 ships; the next year 10 German yards turned out 94 ships; the next year there were 9 yards; then 7, 8, 7, etc.; and in those eight or nine years they turned out from 30 to 60 ships a year. In the nine years they had not reached a tonnage of 100,000 tons. During all that time they were absorbing British tonnage; they were large patrons of the British yards; they were practically placing their orders there and buying the best they could. Yet under that stimulus, under the stimulus of free ships and being shipowners, they began to increase their own facilities, until in 1897 in 20 yards they built 94 ships; they were tramp ships and did not get subsidies; the next year Germany had 17 yards and built 97 ships; the next year there was an increase to 23 yards, which built 121 ships. There is no more brilliant example of maritime prosperity than that of Germany (p. 1442).

SOUTHERN VIEWS ON THE QUESTION.

Mr. H. Mosle, Galveston, Tex.:

I am fully convinced that any subsidy will be a failure, and absolutely convinced that we will not have any merchant marine unless we have free trade, free ships, and, what is more than free ships, free crews (p. 1489).

Mr. C. H. Ellis, New Orleans, La., of the United Fruit Steamship Company:

We have a large fleet of vessels under the Norwegian, the Swedish, German, English, and American flags. We can operate a Norwegian vessel 30 per cent less than we can an American vessel. My plan, as far as the port of New Orleans is concerned, would be to at first allow the owners of all foreign vessels, who are American citizens, to transfer those vessels to the American flag, giving them five years' time in which to do so; officer them with Americans, but take the sailors and firemen from any nationality. England is our most formidable competitor, and then Norway; Norway gives no subsidy, and the subsidy that England gives is an admiralty subvention; the English merchant marine, which does the transporting of the better part of the commerce of the world and which consists principally of so-called tramps, gets no subsidy (p. 1537).

Mr. W. P. Ross, New Orleans, La., steamship agent for foreign ships:

As a general commercial question, there is no doubt but that an abrogation of present navigation laws would enable Americans to secure some of the bargains which are now obtainable in foreign ships, and would do more than all other methods put together to rehabilitate the American marine. The mail subvention law should be remodeled to fit business-like conditions (p. 1546).

Capt. M. W. Tupper, shipmaster, Brunswick, Ga.:

I do not see how subsidies, mail contracts, etc., can be made to assist all our shipowners, but I am firmly convinced that the recommendations made by the New York Maritime Exchange is the only way our merchant marine can be benefited (p. 1610).

Mr. W. S. Tyson, Savannah, Ga.:

He favored a liberal subsidy for mail contracts, but for the general merchant marine a differential tariff (p. 1614).

Mr. F. D. Aiken, exporter, Brunswick, Ga.:

I believe in discriminating duties and generous mail contracts (p. 1623).

Capt. J. W. McCarrick, Newport News, Va., representing the Clyde Line at Norfolk, Va.:

We of Norfolk, Richmond, Petersburg, Lynchburg, Danville, and Alexandria once endorsed the Dingley ship-subsidy bill. Since then we have changed our minds. We are now for more liberal contracts for carrying the mails and discriminating duties on indirect commerce (p. 1632).

Capt. Henry E. Parker, Newport News, Va.:

He favored a discriminating duty (p. 1638).

Hon. William J. Bryan, in the Commoner for 1906, in volume 6, page 339, says:

There are two kinds of aid which the Democrats could consistently favor. There is the aid which could be given through discriminating duties. A reduction of duties on articles brought into the country in American bottoms would give to the shipowner an advantage without an additional tax upon the people, but those who oppose tariff reduction would, of course, oppose this breach in the tariff wall.

The other plan is to put into transports a part of the money that is now put into war ships and let the transports be run to southern ports by the Government, or leased on terms which are equitable for us in building up a mail and trade line.

EXHIBIT B.

OUR FOREIGN TRADE.

Without subsidies our manufacturers, traders, exporters, and importers have gone into every corner of the world with their wares and have built up a great foreign trade.

WHAT IS OUR TRADE?

The Statistical Abstract for 1908 answers as follows:

OUR IMPORT TRADE.

Foodstuffs, crude	\$145,577,427
Foodstuffs, prepared	147,008,870
Crude materials for manufacturing	363,823,723
Partly finished manufactures	196,320,135
Finished manufactures	331,204,635
Miscellaneous	10,406,902
Total	1,194,341,702

OUR EXPORT TRADE.

Foodstuffs, crude.....	\$189,051,824
Foodstuffs, prepared.....	331,961,663
Crude materials for manufacturing.....	556,681,462
Partly finished manufactures.....	261,105,883
Finished manufactures.....	489,469,958
Miscellaneous.....	6,515,567
Total.....	1,834,786,357

RÉSUMÉ.

Imports.....	1,194,341,792
Exports.....	1,834,786,357
Total.....	3,029,128,149

EXHIBIT C.

World's tonnage, 1906.

	Steam.	Sail.
	<i>Gross tons.</i>	<i>Net tons.</i>
The world.....	33,331,888	6,993,730
British.....	16,976,010	1,590,000
American.....	1,959,985	1,480,513
German.....	3,743,890	458,633
French.....	1,442,263	510,397
Norwegian.....	1,311,379	636,601

Potential tonnage.

The world.....	89,527,042
British.....	43,010,354
American.....	6,683,909
German.....	9,770,731
French.....	3,718,865
Norwegian.....	4,032,517

Consul-General Diederich, of Antwerp, in November Monthly Consular and Trade Report, page 54, says:

The greater part of the world's tonnage for several months has been unproductive. The home ports of the great ocean lines are filled with steamers lying idle. Passenger steamers coming from South America to Europe have been obliged to pay for the privilege of carrying grain in order to get ballast. Freight to India, which were formerly \$3.65 to \$4.86 a ton, have been reduced to \$1.22 to \$1.70.

EXHIBIT D.

Eleven-year growth of imports.

Country.	Value, 1897.	Value, 1907.	Increase.
			<i>Per cent.</i>
Europe:			
Austria-Hungary.....	\$8,000,000	\$16,000,000	100
Belgium.....	14,000,000	30,000,000	114
Denmark.....	400,000	1,200,000	200
Greece.....	700,000	3,000,000	320
Portugal.....	2,000,000	6,400,000	220
Turkey.....	2,700,000	6,900,000	150
North America:			
Canada.....	40,000,000	74,000,000	85
Costa Rica.....	3,400,000	4,900,000	44
Guatemala.....	1,800,000	3,800,000	111
Nicaragua.....	900,000	2,300,000	155
Salvador.....	1,100,000	1,171,000	6
British West Indies.....	12,300,000	12,200,000	Loss.
Danish West Indies.....	400,000	500,000	25
Haiti.....	1,400,000	1,300,000	Loss.
Santo Domingo.....	2,400,000	3,400,000	4
South America:			
Argentina.....	11,000,000	17,000,000	54
Brazil.....	69,000,000	98,000,000	42
Chile.....	3,700,000	18,300,000	390
Colombia.....	4,700,000	6,300,000	34
Ecuador.....	600,000	3,000,000	400
Peru.....	700,000	4,900,000	600
Uruguay.....	3,500,000	3,200,000	Loss.
Venezuela.....	9,500,000	7,800,000	Loss.
Asia:			
Aden.....	1,500,000	2,600,000	73
Chinese Empire.....	20,400,000	33,500,000	64
East Indies, British.....	20,500,000	84,000,000	309
East Indies, Dutch.....	15,600,000	11,400,000	Loss.
Hongkong.....	1,000,000	2,700,000	170
Japan.....	24,000,000	70,000,000	190
Oceania:			
British Australasia.....	6,000,000	17,000,000	183
French Oceania.....	400,000	550,000	37
Africa:			
British Africa.....	1,500,000	2,700,000	80
Egypt.....	7,000,000	16,600,000	137

RECAPITULATION, IMPORTS.

All Europe.....	\$430,000,000	\$747,000,000	73
All North America.....	105,000,000	263,000,000	150
All South America.....	107,000,000	190,000,000	50
All Asia.....	88,000,000	212,000,000	140
All Oceania.....	24,400,000	29,800,000	22
All Africa.....	10,000,000	22,000,000	120

Exports.

Country.	1897.	1907.	Increase.
			<i>Per cent.</i>
Europe:			
Austria-Hungary.....	\$4,000,000	\$15,000,000	275
Belgium.....	33,000,000	51,500,000	56
Denmark.....	10,200,000	23,400,000	129
Portugal.....	2,500,000	2,600,000	4
Turkey.....	55,000	1,125,000	1,900
Germany.....	125,000,000	257,000,000	105
Italy.....	22,000,000	62,000,000	181
Sweden and Norway.....	5,500,000	9,500,000	72
United Kingdom.....	483,000,000	608,000,000	25
North America:			
Canada.....	65,000,000	183,000,000	181
Costa Rica.....	1,400,000	2,500,000	78
Guatemala.....	3,000,000	2,800,000	Loss.
Nicaragua.....	1,200,000	1,900,000	58
Salvador.....	1,619,000	1,603,000	Loss.
British West Indies.....	7,900,000	10,800,000	36
Danish West Indies.....	500,000	800,000	60
Haiti.....	3,800,000	2,900,000	Loss.
Santo Domingo.....	1,000,000	2,500,000	150
South America:			
Argentina.....	6,500,000	32,200,000	395
Brazil.....	12,500,000	18,700,000	49
Chile.....	2,600,000	10,200,000	29
Colombia.....	3,900,000	3,000,000	Loss.
Ecuador.....	800,000	1,800,000	125
Peru.....	1,100,000	6,000,000	445
Uruguay.....	1,200,000	3,400,000	183
Venezuela.....	3,400,000	3,000,000	Loss.
Asia:			
Aden.....	1,000,000	2,100,000	110
Chinese Empire.....	12,000,000	25,800,000	115
East Indies, British.....	4,000,000	9,000,000	125
East Indies, Dutch.....	2,094,000	2,041,000	Loss.
Hongkong.....	6,000,000	8,300,000	39
Japan.....	13,100,000	38,800,000	196
Oceania: British Australasia.....	17,500,000	32,000,000	82
Africa:			
British.....	13,100,000	10,500,000	Loss.
Egypt.....	400,000	1,200,000	200

RECAPITULATION, EXPORTS.

All Europe.....	\$800,000,000	\$1,300,000,000	62
All North America.....	125,000,000	350,000,000	180
All South America.....	34,000,000	92,000,000	150
All Asia.....	39,000,000	93,000,000	138
All Oceania.....	23,000,000	42,000,000	82
All Africa.....	17,000,000	16,500,000	Loss.

Our gain in exports to Europe—\$500,000,000—was but little less than our entire export trade to all the rest of the world in 1907, while our gain to Canada—\$118,000—was but little less than the whole trade of Asia and Oceania combined, or all South America and Oceania combined, and a little more than all Africa and South America combined, or than all Asia and Africa combined. Our great and transcendent gains have been precisely where our mail subsidies had no place.

EXHIBIT E.

The following tables show that mail steamers form a most insignificant part of a merchant marine:

Comparison of mail with merchant steamers.

In 1901, 2,075 British vessels passed through the Suez Canal, in kind as follows:

	Number.	Tons.
Merchant vessels.....	1,778	5,261,887
Mail steamers.....	194	766,823
War ships.....	48	73,943
Government charters.....	14	60,907
In ballast.....	41	89,259
Total.....	2,075	10,823,840

From this it is evident that the ratio of mail steamers to merchant vessels, or the subsidy traffic in comparison with the nonsubsidized traffic of Great Britain in 1901, as told by Suez Canal shipments, is about 1 in 10, or 10.9 per cent.

In 1907 Great Britain had in the foreign trade—

	Number.	Tons.
Sailing vessels.....	712	1,049,108
Steam vessels.....	4,044	8,695,593
Total.....	4,756	9,744,701

Less than 200 of these are mail steamers.

In the home trade she has—

	Number.	Tons.
Sailing vessels.....	5,217	305,976
Steam vessels.....	4,358	583,836
Total.....	9,575	889,812

Less than 100 of these are mail steamers.
Partly in home and partly in foreign trade:

	Number.	Tons.
Sailing vessels.....	77	10,384
Steam vessels.....	308	390,875
Total.....	385	401,259

Total British marine:

	Number.	Tons.
Sailing vessels.....	5,916	1,365,468
Steam vessels.....	8,710	9,670,304
Total.....	14,626	11,035,772

Of which less than 5 per cent is subsidized in any way.

EXHIBIT F.

SUBSIDIES GRANTED BY THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT.

From the "Return of all sums payable out of the exchequer in the year 1906-7 in respect of steamship subsidies for foreign and colonial services," just issued, Consul-General Robert J. Wynne, of London, learns that the following yearly subsidies are granted by the British Government:

London, Chatham and Dover Railway Company, mail service to France.....	\$121,662
Great Eastern Railway Company, mail service to Holland.....	4,137
Cunard Steamship Company.....	330,923
Cunard Steamship Company.....	102,196
Pacific Steam Navigation Company.....	155,728
African and British and African companies.....	74,725
Union Castle Steamship Company.....	27,106
British India Steamship Company.....	43,798
Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company.....	1,654,610
Canadian Pacific Railway Company.....	291,990
Ally Mail Steamship Company.....	9,733
Royal Mail Steamship Company.....	85,164
Total.....	2,901,772

The second sum of \$102,196, payable to the Cunard Company, is charged to navy funds. This was increased to \$364,987 for the two new vessels (*Lusitania* and *Mauretania*) after their first voyages. The above sums are gross amounts. An aggregate of \$890,228, made up from contributions from colonies and sea postage, is to be set off against them, leaving a net charge on the exchequer of \$1,525,040.

EXHIBIT G.

[From the American Review of Reviews, February, 1910.]

HOW TO IMPROVE OUR SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE.

The old adage, "There are none so blind as those who will not see," has never been more strikingly exemplified than in the attitude of the merchants of the United States toward South American trade. They have watched with satisfaction, writes Prof. William R. Shepherd in the Political Science Quarterly, the American "invasion" of both Europe and Asia, and in proportion as the sale of their commodities has netted a fair amount of profit, they have fostered their business interests in those continents. But, favored with astounding success eastward and westward and enjoying a huge and lucrative market at home, they have become relatively oblivious to the fact that the trade of a great region to the southward is falling a prey to the European "invader." They seem to think, "Whenever we want the trade of South America, we can easily get it." They may, however, discover too late that the market in that quarter is preempted. Professor Shepherd has made several visits to the principal countries of the southern continent, so that his observations are especially valuable as coming from one who has a close and practical acquaintance with his subject. He sets forth some of the reasons why our trade with our southern neighbors is so meager, and officers certain suggestions as to its improvement.

The chief rivals of the United States in South America are England and Germany, and the most powerful competitor to be reckoned with is the German. He takes care to acquaint himself thoroughly, in advance, with the language of the country, its customs, its needs, and its economic conditions in general.

He learns also the languages of his principal competitors in that market. * * * Tacitful and complaisant as regards native sympathies and prejudices, he avoids anything that might provoke their antagonism. Rather than hold himself socially aloof, he will marry into a native family; but, although he may identify himself with the interests of the country he predestinately abstains from undue participation in its politics. * * * He investigates with patient care all phases of the commercial and industrial situation which may be of service to him. * * * Then, after all the requirements of caution and deliberation are satisfied, he locates his business, or places his investment, with a degree of shrewdness that does him credit. * * *

Time was when the English were known as the nation of shopkeepers, with all the obsequious arts that distinguish the craft. Now the title seems to be passing to the Germans.

By way of contrast, Professor Shepherd points out certain traits and practices of the German's American rival, and calls attention to three false notions that check our South American trade. (1) The idea is held that "the inhabitants of South America are scarcely half civilized."

Not infrequently the American capitalist declines to invest his money in South American enterprises because he believes that it will not be protected. If we knew more about that continent and its peoples, the injustice of such an attitude of mind would be apparent enough. British and German capitalists encounter no special difficulty in securing profitable returns from their investments, and they do so without invoking the aid of warships and without conniving at revolutions. On the other hand, it is a fact too well known to need comment that the corrupt conduct of Americans in many parts of the southern continent has served to injure the good name of the United States and to awaken a corresponding distrust of us in the minds of the South Americans themselves.

(2) The second false notion is "that the American way of doing business is necessarily the best in the world."

In common with this spirit are the ideas, first, that if the South Americans want our goods they should simply send for them; and, second, that anything will do for South America. Both ideas are responsible for much of the prejudice existing on that continent against the use of our products. If orders are received from South America, the American manufacturer too often ignores them or ships something not desired. * * * Not infrequently he is slow about filling orders and careless or indifferent about returning articles, especially parts of machinery sent to him for repair or replacement. The result of such a procedure is that no more orders will be received from the South American merchant so treated.

If, however, the American exporter does condescend to execute the orders he receives, the probability is that the goods will be packed in "shades, sizes, and measures, and in weights and quantities unusual in South America. Pounds, quarts, and yards have no place in countries where the metric system prevails." Too often, also, the packing is done in the most careless fashion.

It must be remembered that before they reach their destination packages are liable to a great deal of knocking about in the course of transportation by ocean-going vessel, lighter, river steamboat, railway, ox cart, beast of burden, and human carrier. Their possible exposure also to hot and moist temperatures may easily work damage both to covering and to contents. Nevertheless, huge boxes, flimsily constructed of thin boards, * * * are filled with heavy merchandise and dispatched to some point in South America, only to be broken open, either accidentally or intentionally by thieving freight handlers.

(3) The third of the false notions is "the belief that the American article is the best in the world and must commend itself spontaneously wherever it goes."

In some cases, perhaps, the belief may be well founded; but this idea of the universal superiority of American materials and American workmanship over anything of a like sort which can be furnished by Europe is fast becoming a more or less gratuitous assumption.

In the way of suggestions for the development of our South American commerce, Professor Shepherd first proposes that "we stop committing the various faults" of which we have been guilty and "profit by the examples of our European rivals." We shall be able to secure our share of the trade when "the views and methods of our business men undergo a change which will enable them to cope successfully with their rivals in general, and with the Germans in particular." There are three things we ought to do:

The first is to get a thorough first-hand acquaintance with South American conditions. The second is to make a careful examination of the examples set by our European competitors in the conviction that we shall be able to improve vastly upon these models. Our third duty is so to modify certain of our business methods as to render them thoroughly effective in South America.

Other suggestions made by Professor Shepherd are in substance as follows:

Let members of our exporting firms visit the South American countries and observe for themselves the conditions existing there.

In conjunction with what is furnished by Europe, more of our capital should be invested in South America.

American banks should be established in South American towns.

American business men should treat their South American customers with as much regard as they do those at home. Goods should be shipped in the form and sizes requested by the customer. Packers thoroughly familiar with conditions of climate and transportation should be employed.

The American exporter should keep himself thoroughly well posted on changes in the tariff system.

Liberal concessions in the periods of payments should be allowed.

Advertising in the local newspapers and magazines should be resorted to.

Competent salesmen should make personal solicitation for trade.

Above all, American merchants should have in every field of their activities in South America a complete assortment of samples.

EXHIBIT H.

REASONS FOR LACK OF TRADE.

China, Consul Gracey, Tsingtau, Monthly Consular and Trade Reports, June, 1908:

1. American prices too high.
2. System of discounts not clear. European firms quote flat prices.
3. Rely too much on catalogues printed in English.
4. No drummers are sent.
5. Goods not made to suit local wants.
6. Too long to deliver.
7. System of credits not favorable.
8. Bad packing.

Honduras, Consul Linard, Ceiba, Monthly Consular and Trade Reports, June, 1908:

1. Rely on consul rather than an agent of their own.
2. Use English language and catalogues.
3. Do not pay return postage when bidding for business.
4. Do not study local wants.
5. Unload old stocks.
6. Credits not favorable.
7. Packing bad.

Ecuador, Consul Hedian, Monthly Consular and Trade Reports, February, 1909:

1. Credits not favorable.
2. Prices too high.
3. Local customs ignored.

Colombia, Consul Manning, Monthly Consular and Trade Reports, May, 1908:

1. Americans disregard shipping instructions.
2. They do not send identical goods ordered.
3. They ignore local demands.
4. The packing is bad.
5. They do not study the customs duties of the customers.

Dominica, Consul Totten, Monthly Consular and Trade Reports, June, 1909:

Americans do not put postage sufficient on letters to customers, thus involving a larger postage due and a fine besides.

Switzerland, Consul Gifford, Monthly Consular and Trade Reports, June, 1909:

The relatively small quantity of American manufactured goods sold in Switzerland may perhaps be accounted for in part by lack of direct personal effort on the part of American manufacturers and exporters. Out of 7,097 foreign travelers engaged in selling in Switzerland but 4 were from the United States.

Cartagena, Consul Manning, Monthly Consular and Trade Reports, June, 1909:

Americans lose trade here by neglecting one of the principal elements in the extensive foreign trade, namely, the commercial traveler.

REASONS FOR GROWTH OF TRADE.

Brazil, Consul Anderson, Rio, Monthly Consular and Trade Reports, January, 1909:

The chief element in the increase, beyond the least doubt, was the increased interest of American exporters in the Brazilian field. This interest led to practical efforts on the part of many manufacturers and other exporters who had never before attempted to do anything in South America to secure trade.

1. They sent men who secured trade.
2. This trade will only be limited by the energy and persistence of its starters.
3. Nothing but actual experiment will develop opportunities.
4. Selling at long range a failure.
5. The manufacturer must satisfy himself by patient and thorough investigation whether or not there is anything for him in the trade.

It is well to turn from roseate subsidy creators of trade to the sounder principles of genuine trade extension.

Calcutta, Consul-General Michael, Monthly Consular and Trade Reports, June, 1909:

On Ohio company sent its vice-president to India. He established, himself, a campaign of investigation and business action. He succeeded in Calcutta and India, and was equally successful in Australia and the Far East.

No American manufacturer has ever succeeded in winning trade in India by any other method, and success by any other method, under existing conditions in India, is wholly impossible.

Carlsbad, Consul Twells, Monthly Consular and Trade Reports, May, 1908:

Business in Austria can in most cases only be done if the customers are visited personally by American merchants or representatives. Sending catalogues is of little importance.

REASONS WHY GERMANS SUCCEED.

Consul Harris, Nuremberg, Monthly Consular and Trade Reports, July, 1908:

1. The smallest manufacturers reach out and sell foreign buyers, visiting the district.
2. They appreciate the foreign market.
3. They seek it with a definite purpose.
4. They make goods to suit the buyer exactly.

EXHIBIT I.

SMALL SHIPS DO THE WORLD'S CARRYING TRADE.

The ships launched by the shipyards of the United Kingdom in 1906 as set out in the report of our Commissioner of Navigation for 1907, by number and kind, were as follows:

Tonnage.	Number.	
	Steam.	Sail.
Under 100 tons.....	21	6
100 tons and under 200.....	91	32
200 tons and under 500.....	208	24
500 tons and under 1,000.....	55	8
1,000 tons and under 2,000.....	82	
2,000 tons and under 3,000.....	49	
3,000 tons and under 4,000.....	141	
4,000 tons and under 5,000.....	107	
5,000 tons and under 6,000.....	23	
6,000 tons and under 7,000.....	18	
7,000 tons and under 8,000.....	8	
8,000 tons and under 9,000.....	5	
9,000 tons and under 10,000.....	1	
10,000 tons and under 12,000.....	2	
12,000 tons and under 15,000.....	1	
20,000 tons and above.....	1	
Total.....	815	71

Excluding steamers of less than 500 tons, the average tonnage launched in the United Kingdom in 1906 was 3,526 tons, gross.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MOREHEAD].

Mr. MOREHEAD. Mr. Chairman, as it is manifest that in the coming campaign one of the principal issues will be the tariff in general and the Payne bill in particular as expressing the Republican idea of what a protective tariff means, it is but just and right that the voters should know the truth and have the light of history thrown upon the subject, that the people may be made familiar with the results of putting the Democratic idea of free trade into law, as far as it is possible to do so consistent with the revenue needs of the Government.

Possibly the nearest approach to free trade we have ever had was the amended tariff act of 1857, which brought disaster and suffering to this country such as it has never experienced before in time of peace. This condition is most fittingly described in the first annual message of President Buchanan, which was, in part, as follows:

WASHINGTON, December 8, 1857.

Fellow-citizens of the Senate and House of Representatives:

But first, and above all, our thanks are due to Almighty God for the numerous benefits which He has bestowed upon his people, and our united prayers ought to ascend to Him that He would continue to bless our great Republic in time to come as He has blessed it in time past. Since the adjournment of the last Congress our constituents have enjoyed an unusual degree of health. The earth has yielded her fruits abundantly and has bountifully rewarded the toil of the husbandman. Our great staples have commanded high prices, and up till within a brief period our manufacturing, mineral, and mechanical occupation have largely partaken of general prosperity. We have possessed all the elements of natural wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country in its monetary interests is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture and in all the elements in national wealth, we find our manufactures suspended, our public work retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

This tells us how public enterprises were destroyed, how business was suspended, and how want and suffering invaded the homes of the wage-earners all over the land under free trade before the war.

But this was not all the story, for in his second annual message of December, 1858, President Buchanan tells how this paralysis of the business of the country had affected the country's revenues and had so reduced them that the Government had to sell bonds in order to raise funds to meet the necessary expenses of the Government. Here is that part of his message:

WASHINGTON, December 6, 1858.

Fellow-citizens of the Senate and House of Representatives:

To supply the deficiency, Congress, by the act of December 23, 1857, authorized the issue of \$20,000,000 of Treasury notes, and this proving inadequate they authorized, by the act of June 14, 1858, a loan of \$20,000,000 "to be applied to the payment of appropriations made by law."

The war between the States followed Buchanan's administration, the cost of which was so great that the question of protection and free trade did not enter so much into legislation for many years as did the matter of revenue. But by the time of the first administration of Mr. Cleveland and that of Mr. Harrison the country had reached a condition where our debt was so reduced and our wealth so increased that the time had come when the question of protection and free trade became paramount, and the McKinley bill was passed embodying the Republican idea of protection. This law was attacked as bitterly then as the Payne bill now is, and the people were so deceived about it that the result of the election of 1892 was to put the Democratic party in power in every department of the Government for the first time since the war. The McKinley law went into operation in 1890. Let the annual report of Dun's commercial agency tell the story of how it affected the country. In its issue of December 31, 1892, it said:

The most prosperous year ever known in business closes to-day with strong favorable indications for the future. From nearly all points comes the report that the holiday trade has been the largest ever known, and while wholesale trade is not usually active at this season of stock taking, it is now remarkably large. Settlements through clearing houses outside New York in December were apparently the largest ever made in any month, exceeding last year's by more than 10 per cent. For the year the volume is also about 10 per cent larger than last year, and the largest ever known. Railroad earnings in December show an increase of about 3 per cent over last year, and for the year an increase of about 55 per cent. For the year the excess of merchandise exports has been not far from \$70,000,000, with the largest imports and the largest total of exports and imports ever known in any year, etc.

This tells what protection under the McKinley law did for this country. It tells us that when the Republicans went out of power in 1893 they left the country under a protective law in the most prosperous condition it has ever known.

The Democrats again had the power to write their ideas on the tariff into law in 1894 under the second administration of Mr. Cleveland, and the result was exactly the same as under Mr. Buchanan. The very anticipation of this law brought such

suffering and so desperate were the needs of the Government that Mr. Cleveland called an extra session of Congress to try and avert the storm that was breaking over the country, the condition of which he describes in his first message as follows:

EXECUTIVE MANSION, August 8, 1893.

To the Congress of the United States:

The existence of an alarming and extraordinary business situation, involving the welfare and prosperity of all our people, has constrained me to call together in extra session the people's representatives in Congress to the end that through a wise and patriotic exercise of the legislative duty with which they are solely charged present evils may be mitigated and dangers threatening the future may be averted.

Our unfortunate financial plight is not the result of untoward events, nor of conditions relative to our natural resources, nor is it traceable to any of the afflictions which frequently check national growth and prosperity. With plentiful crops, with abundant promise of remunerative production and manufacture, with unusual invitation to safe investment, and with satisfactory assurance to business enterprise, suddenly financial distrust and fear have sprung up on every side. Numerous moneyed institutions have suspended because abundant assets were not immediately available to meet the demands of frightened depositors. Surviving corporations and individuals are content to keep in hand the money they are usually anxious to loan, and those engaged in legitimate business are surprised to find that the securities they offer for loans, though heretofore satisfactory, are no longer accepted. Values supposed to be fixed the fast becoming conjectural, and loss and failure have invaded every branch of business.

The condition is also fully described in Dun's Review of December 30, 1893, which says:

Starting with the largest trade ever known, mills crowded with work, and all business stimulated by high hopes, the year 1893 has proved, in sudden shrinkage of trade, in commercial disasters, and depression of industries, the worst for fifty years. Whether the financial results of the panic of 1837 were relatively more severe, the scanty records of that time do not clearly show. The year closes with prices of many products the lowest ever known, with millions of workers seeking in vain for work, and with charity laboring to keep back suffering and starvation in all our cities. All hope the new year may bring brighter days, but the dying year leaves only a dismal record.

In a subsequent message Mr. Cleveland tells the same story as Mr. Buchanan of the sale of bonds in time of peace to protect the credit of the Government, until \$262,000,000 in bonds had been sold and that much added to the national debt. So much for the results of Democratic policies and legislation on the National Government. The country prosperous and happy under protection, bankrupt and penalties for its wage-earners, who became beggars, under free trade.

Let us examine the effect of Democratic legislation on the state governments, and in order that the story may not be too long I will only allude to the effect on my own State, and will content myself by a few extracts from the reports of the various state departments.

It may seem a startling statement, but it is, nevertheless, true that the taxable property of my State sank more than \$12,000,000 from 1891 to 1897. To be exact I will quote from page 9 of the auditor's report for 1897, which is as follows:

The report of 1891, covering the tax returns of 1890, shows the aggregate taxable value of real and personal property to have been \$242,449,891. The current report (1897), covering the tax returns of 1896, shows the aggregate taxable value of the same kind of property to be \$229,854,499. The decrease in value, therefore, from 1890 to 1896 is \$12,595,392.

This was the result to my State under the Wilson-Gorman law, the culmination of Democratic wisdom as exemplified by that act. In 1897 the Dingley bill was passed, when we again began to mend our fortune, as is shown by the auditor's report for 1898, on page 21, which says:

An increase in the taxable value of real and personal property for 1898 over 1897 makes a net decrease in the value of such property from 1892 to 1898 of \$10,202,472.

This shows an increase, in round numbers, of \$2,393,000 the first year after the return to Republican policies, which increase has continued and grown better year by year until my State has prospered as never before, until to-day she is worth in taxable property probably over \$600,000,000, or more than two and a half times what she was in 1897, for our taxable value is given in the auditor's report for 1908 as \$573,485,331, or just two and a half times as much as it was when the Wilson-Gorman Democratic measure was repealed.

These are the figures we find in the auditor's report, but the tribute to the wisdom of Republican legislation is equally as eloquent in the other departments of the State. Quoting from the report of the secretary of state, on page 11, I find that there were only 21 corporations chartered by the secretary of state in 1893, and not over 151 in any year during Mr. Cleveland's administration; but just as soon as Democracy went out of power the people began to do business, 207 corporations being chartered in 1899, 306 in 1900, 327 in 1901, 325 in 1902, 554 in 1903, 540 in 1904, 697 in 1905, 821 in 1906, 839 in 1907, 763 in 1908, and 1,051 in 1909. The falling off in 1908 was probably due to the attack on capital, especially on the railroads, by our state officials about that time under laws passed by the Demo-

cratic legislature of 1907, as will appear from the following letter:

BALTIMORE, MD., June 26, 1908.
MR. AMBROSE A. FEATHERSTONE, JR.,
Asheville, N. C.

DEAR SIR: We have your favor of the 25th instant, for which we thank you very much, but we will not be interested in Canton, N. C., 5 per cent improvement bonds. The fact of the matter is that the attacks on corporations and money interests by your State has stopped any investment demand for securities in your State. Until there is a radical change, we do not see any hopes of doing business in North Carolina securities.

We have been large handlers of North Carolina securities and regret that the present state of affairs should have been brought about by your governor and legislature.

Very truly, yours,

TOWNSEND SCOTT & SON.

These corporations were formed to do business; they had to employ labor; that labor had to be fed, clothed, and housed; this food had to be raised; this made a demand for farm labor, and raised the price of both land and labor; these houses had to be built; this made a demand for workmen and material; these workmen had to be fed; this gave an additional need for food and clothes; and so one industry created a demand for another until we find the result to the State is that its taxable value has increased more than two and a half times in the past twelve years what it was when the Democrats passed out of power, and our labor is better paid and more universally employed at this time than ever before.

That I may not seem to exaggerate, I will quote from page 262 of the Report of the Commissioner of Labor and Printing of North Carolina for 1900, which shows that in 1899 there were 176 miscellaneous factories in the State, employing 4,610 laborers, and the highest paid man got \$1.45 per day, and the lowest 70 cents per day, while in 1908 there were 555 miscellaneous factories, employing 30,053 laborers, and the highest paid was \$2.40 per day; the lowest, 96 cents. Behold the contrast. Thirty thousand laborers employed in 1908 against 4,600 in 1899, many getting \$2.40 per day in 1908 against \$1.45 in 1899. Is it any wonder they are leaving the farms for the factories, and is it any wonder that the price of food products has advanced when the price of labor has nearly doubled? But the capital invested shows the same important increase, as it has grown from \$3,221,100 in 1900 to \$42,410,420 in 1908—invested in these miscellaneous factories.

The cotton-mill industry is most remarkable; in fact, its advance is even greater than in the miscellaneous factories. I quote from page 263 of the same report: In 1899 we had in North Carolina 215 cotton mills, with a capital of \$20,500,000, employing 33,764 laborers, the highest price paid being \$1.10 per day and the lowest 67 cents. In 1908 we had 352 cotton mills, with a capital of \$49,192,300, employing 59,414 laborers, the highest paid \$2.50 per day and the lowest 79 cents. Here we find that in the last ten years the wages of the best men have been more than doubled in the cotton mills. Again I repeat, is it any wonder that men have left the farms and gone to the mills, and thus become consumers and buyers of the very farm products they were producing under the free-trade policies of our friends the Democrats?

I will not be tedious by continuing this statement in detail, as the story is the same in every avenue of industry, whether it be the farm, the mill, the railroad, or any enterprise in my State, until we have reached the point where labor was never as well paid as to-day and the farmer was never as well rewarded for the products of his toil. The housewife was never surrounded with as many comforts as to-day, and the children were never as well clothed, housed, or educated. Let me illustrate:

The frying size chicken that sold for 10 cents to 12½ cents under Mr. Cleveland sells to-day for 40 cents; the mother of this chicken that was considered dear at 25 cents when the Wilson-Gorman bill was a law and Mr. Cleveland was President, brings to-day from 75 cents to \$1. The wheat that sold at from 40 cents to 50 cents per bushel under Democracy to-day brings \$1.30 to \$1.45 a bushel. The corn that sold during the Cleveland administration at 30 cents a bushel to-day brings 90 cents to \$1. The 5-cent cotton under Mr. Cleveland is 15-cent cotton now. The mule that cultivated the wheat and corn and cotton that could be bought at from \$75 to \$125 under Mr. Cleveland to-day brings \$250 to \$300. And so the story goes all along the line, all of which is repeated in the editorials of the papers from every part of my State, a few of which I will quote:

The Twin City Sentinel, of Winston-Salem, in its issue of January 5, 1910, says:

The local savings banks did a rushing business to-day. The deposits were perhaps the largest in the history of these institutions for one day. One of the cashiers remarked this afternoon that he would have to content himself with two meals to-day, as the depositors had not given him any showing to get dinner, and that at that hour it appeared supper would come at a rather late hour. The largest single bank deposit reported was over \$100,000.

These things are evidence of prosperity, and the adoption of good resolutions on the part of the people to save money and establish a bank account.

The Twin City banks are strong and aggressive, and it is with pleasure that the Sentinel notes these evidences of confidence on the part of the people and their faith in these institutions to aid them in becoming more substantial and successful citizens.

Again, in its issue of January 13, 1910, it says:

If the present year is not the best in the history of the South, as far as railroad building is concerned, we shall be very much surprised. The new construction and improvement work already announced give a substantial basis for this assertion. Never before has such a large amount of work been contemplated.

All of this is significant and encouraging, to say the least. It shows conclusively that the South is enjoying solid prosperity and that this prosperity bids fair to continue. There is no surer indication of present and future progress than is furnished by railroad developments both in reference to the building of new lines and the improvement of old lines.

In its issue of April 20 it says:

The South is starting off the new year with splendid prospects along the industrial lines. Every few days big enterprises of various kinds are announced.

I can not help contrasting this condition under the Payne law with what this same Democratic organ said in its issue of October 3, 1893, with the possibility of free trade in view, which was as follows:

In the memory of us all the year 1893 will long be remembered. It is a year of disaster from the storm, of loss of life by accident, of murder, thefts, lynchings. One of its most remarkable aspects is the number of business failures, computed now at some twelve thousands with liabilities of \$324,087,768. The year 1893 is peculiarly a year of financial disturbance.

To continue the story of the great prosperity with which we are now blessed, in the Tradesman of January 28, 1910, published in Chattanooga, we find the following business enterprises reported as starting that week in my State:

Wake Forest: Fifty thousand dollar improvement company.
Canton: Twenty-five thousand dollar electric-light company.
Manteo: Ten thousand dollar insurance company.
Washington: One hundred thousand dollar hardware company.
Wellford: Forty thousand dollar cotton and woolen mills.
Newberne: Three hundred and fifty thousand dollar medicine factory.
Lake Waccama: Two hundred and fifty thousand dollar box and barrel factory.
Red Springs: Sixty thousand dollar iron-working plant.

With the story continued for all the Southern States.

Here is an extract from the News and Observer of January 4, 1910:

The year 1909 in North Carolina witnessed general prosperity, the advance of every material interest of the State, the expansion of industries, and the flourishing growth of cities. New towns have been evoked from farm and forest in every section of the State, there has been an unprecedented increase in population, improvements have been innovated in agriculture and other industries, and the number of new enterprises has been phenomenal.

Here is another extract from the News and Observer of January 2, 1910:

From local enterprises and local investments there will be well above \$100,000 in semiannual dividends given out in Raleigh.

Here is an editorial from the Charlotte Observer of April 20, 1910:

Within the period of fifteen to twenty years the conditions surrounding the southern white workingman have totally changed. A very large proportion have left the farm, and are now working in cotton mills, machine shops, trouser factories, furniture factories, coal mines, iron and steel works, and similar developments. They receive regular and cash payments for their work. In many cases, and perhaps in most cases, the average of these working families receive in cash and handle more money in one week than they used to handle in a whole year. This statement applies to the cash they received and handled and not to the advances made by the merchant. In the new growing towns and cotton-mill villages school conditions, church conditions, sanitary conditions, and every other condition surrounding human life have been infinitely improved. The movement of these ex-farmers from the farms to the factories has not only benefited themselves, but has largely relieved the competition in cotton production, so that those who are yet left on the farm are getting 15 cents for cotton instead of 5 cents, the old price. But this is not all the advantage to those left on the farm. This new factory population furnish cash markets for perishable farm products, and now the farmer who is left on the farm may not only make cotton at a profit, but a great variety of farm products, for which he finds markets among the factory populations. There is still another advantage: The new industrial condition help to support better transportation facilities. These in turn put many perishable farm products into northern markets. Thus the land has a triple value over and above what it used to have. The staple crop brings a better price, the factory populations make a better local market for perishable farm products, and the better transportation facilities make truck and fruit farming profitable.

This tells briefly the story of why farm products are high, and this is why living is high: It is the scarcity and the high price of labor on the farm and the demand for farm products that this mill and other skilled labor has created. No better illustration of this demand can be had than the report of the secretary of the board of trade of Winston-Salem, a town in my district, which was published in the Winston-Salem Journal of April 15, which is in part as follows, which is but a repeti-

tion and a reiteration of like facts from all localities throughout our State where such records and statistics are available:

Following is the story of farm products imported to this town last year: Eleven thousand three hundred barrels of flour, 101,000 bushels of wheat, 4,145 tons of bran and ship stuff, 87,100 bushels of Irish potatoes, 6,025 bushels of sweet potatoes, 37,697 bushels of apples, 25,800 bushels of onions, 2,616,000 pounds of cabbage, 700,000 crates of green peaches, 1,570 tons of hay, 200,000 bushels of rye, 141,350 bushels of oats, 117,400 bushels of corn, 3,500 dozen cans of kraut, 13,960 cases of cheese, 20,600 dozen cans tomatoes, 3,200 dozen cans beans, 4,600 dozen cans apples, 22,600 dozen cans corn, 2,650 cans hominy, 5,000 pounds dried apples, 93,500 pounds dried peaches, 1,725 bushels lima beans, 246,352 bushels navy and white beans, 1,005 barrels vinegar, 2,748,800 pounds pork, 1,657,000 pounds lard, 191,960 pounds beef, 2,250 dozen brooms, 300 dozen washboards, 99,300 pounds tobacco, 31,500 pounds canned meat, and 426,000 pounds meal.

When we read such a report as this, when we know that we have 5,000,000 less cattle, sheep, and hogs in the United States now than ten years ago, with 12,000,000 more people to feed, who have the means with which to enjoy better living, is it any wonder that prices are high?

To sum it all up in a few words, the demand, the supply, the ability to pay the price fix the markets, while the tariff makes or unmakes the opportunity for the laborer to provide the means to meet the demands upon him.

It is a further fact beyond controversy that under the Payne bill a larger per cent of our importations to date pay a less rate of duty than these same imports paid under the Dingley Act for a similar period, and that, notwithstanding this decrease in duty, our treasury deficit is rapidly disappearing under the present tariff law, although it has been operative for only a few months, by reason of the increased volume of business being transacted under its operation. To my mind, both the experience of the past and the logic of figures inevitably point out and indicate with a sureness that must appeal to every thinking man that the South, beyond any section of our land, stands to be most materially benefited by the principle of protective tariff and to suffer more keenly the blighting effect of the free-trade theory.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, if our southland will throw off the thralldom of tradition and prejudice; if we will vote self-interest, as does every other section of the Union, instead of blindly following any phantasy presented under the guise of Democracy, we will regain our lost voice in national affairs.

For the past half century we have been the "solid South," and this solidarity has absolutely emasculated us as a national factor in politics, with the attendant result and effect that we receive no consideration from either party.

We have belonged to the Democrats, and it was not necessary for Democracy to consider us, because it already owned us.

The Republican party had no incentive to heed our appeals, because we have been to a man against Republicanism first, last, and always.

Would it not be good politics—good business—as well as an exhibition of common sense, to vote the way our interests point and place our State in line with those most progressive Commonwealths of the Union, which, by reason of their independence in thought and suffrage, dictate to both parties as to men and policies, with the result that these same States reap the great material advantage accruing to independence of action in all things, but most especially to political independence. [Applause.]

MR. CAMPBELL. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Morse.]

MR. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, from the very beginning of the Nation Congress has recognized the fact that there is latent in every human breast a desire to own land. This land hunger seems to be as widespread as the human race. Our forefathers early recognized the value of this sentiment and in every way possible tried to encourage it. They knew as we know to-day that the crowded tenement house is a very poor place in which to inculcate lessons of patriotism, thrift, and love of country. The hope and safety of our Government and our free institutions repose in the breast of the man whose feet are firmly planted on his own land.

Therefore, from our earliest history it has been the policy of the Government to encourage homestead settlers and home building, and the result has to a great extent shown the wisdom of this policy. As land became scarcer, new territory was added to our already great possessions. The Louisiana Purchase came in 1803, adding a territory so great that the most enthusiastic nation builder of the time could not look forward to the day when all this land would be occupied. In 1819 the great State of Florida with its rich unoccupied fruit land came in. In 1845 the broad prairies of Texas was added to our public domain, giving us room for 10,000,000 more.

In 1846 the boundary line between Canada and the United States was established, which added about four more great States to our already vast extent of territory. Then two years later California came with Nevada, Utah, Arizona, and parts of New Mexico and Colorado.

In 1853 the Gadsden Purchase further added to the extent of our continental possessions.

In 1867 Alaska was purchased from Russia. At that time it was supposed that we were purchasing a vast, desolate, frozen waste that would never be of any value for any purpose except for the raising of fur-bearing animals, but recent explorations and the scientific examination of this vast country by the officers of the Geological Survey have shown that we have in Alaska much valuable agricultural land and a wealth of mineral resources vast beyond the wildest dream of the most enthusiastic advocate of the purchase at the time it was made.

During all these years Congress was passing homestead laws, encouraging people to settle on this wild, uncultivated land, and our gates were thrown wide open and invitations sent broadcast to all the world, inviting people to come here and secure homes for the asking.

Then came the civil war, and during that time and following the war various laws were passed to induce people to still further take up and settle upon the public domain. There was the soldiers and sailors' homestead act, which gave the soldier and the sailor credit for the time of his service in the army. Then, in 1872, came the act which gave all old soldiers who had previously entered a homestead of less than 160 acres another homestead of the difference between the amount previously entered and 160 acres. Then came the various acts giving the widows and children of entrymen the right to enter land.

And in addition to all of these homestead acts came the stone and timber claim act, and following that the enlarged homestead act, known as the Kinkaid law, and various acts passed since that time.

It must be borne in mind that the object of this legislation was twofold. First, the development of the great Mississippi Valley and the West, and the building up of rich commonwealths therein, and, second, the satiating of the land hunger and the development of a high grade of American citizenship.

Not satisfied with this class of legislation, Congress deemed it advisable to take yet another step in the distribution of the untold wealth of the richest nation in all the world. I refer to the mineral-land acts. In the ordinance of 1785, for the disposal of lands in the "Western Territory," it is ordered that there shall be reserved "one-third part of all gold, silver, lead, and copper mines, to be sold, or otherwise disposed of as Congress shall hereafter direct," the deed to be given by the commissioners of the loan office, with a clause of reservation in the words of the act.

By resolution of April 16, 1800, Congress authorized the President to employ an agent to collect information relative to copper mines on the south side of Lake Superior. Thus Congress at this early period seems to have had in mind the direct working and control of mines by the United States.

On March 3, 1807, an act for the sale of certain lands now in Ohio and Indiana, provided as follows:

Any grant which may hereafter be made for a tract of land containing a lead mine which has been discovered prior to the purchase of such tract from the United States shall be considered fraudulent and null; and the President of the United States shall be, and he is hereby, authorized to lease any lead mine which has been or may hereafter be discovered in the Indian Territory, for a term not exceeding five years.

This inaugurated the policy of the United States of leasing mineral lands. This law was continued by two separate acts until March 3, 1819.

The House of Representatives, on February 8, 1823, asked the President for information in regard to the mining regions of the West, and the President in reply transmitted such information as he had at that time, which was, indeed, very meager. This can be found in Executive Document No. 128 of the first session of the Eighteenth Congress.

By the act of March 3, 1829, Congress conferred authority on the President to expose for sale as other public lands the reserved lead mines in the State of Missouri.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. With pleasure.

Mr. BENNET of New York. How far west were the lands that the gentleman refers to?

Mr. MORSE. Well, they were public lands of the Government. They did not include California, Oregon, Wyoming, or Nevada, but they did include what is now Missouri, and it was in particular reference to the lead mines of Missouri that the act was passed.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Did it cover portions of the public domain east of the Mississippi River?

Mr. MORSE. It did; particularly the lead mines of Wisconsin and the copper mines of Michigan, for there was some copper mining done at that time.

President Polk, in his first annual message, recommended the repeal of the leasing system, and said:

More than a million acres of the public lands, supposed to contain lead and other minerals, have been reserved from sale, and numerous leases upon them have been granted to individuals upon a stipulated rent. The system of granting leases has proved to be not only unfavorable to the Government, but unsatisfactory to the citizens who have gone upon the lands. I recommend the repeal of the present system and that these lands be placed under the superintendence and management of the General Land Office as other public lands, and be brought into market and sold upon such terms as Congress in their wisdom may prescribe, reserving to the Government an equitable percentage of the gross amount of mineral product.

In other words, President Polk recommended that the lands be sold and that the Government reserve as a royalty a certain percentage of the minerals recovered from the lands. He, however, on the 11th day of July, 1846, approved an act which provided for the sale of mineral lands, but omitted the royalty clause. Leases were abolished and cash sales substituted.

It is interesting to note in passing some of the reasons given by prominent men for this change in the system. President Fillmore, in his annual message of December 2, 1849, said:

I was at first inclined to favor the system of leasing, as it seemed to promise the largest revenue to the Government and afford the best security against monopolies, but further reflection and our experience in leasing the lead mines and selling lands upon credit have brought my mind to the conclusion that there would be great difficulty in collecting the rents, and that the relation of debtor and creditor between the citizens and the Government would be attended with many mischievous consequences. I therefore recommend that instead of retaining the mineral lands under the permanent control of the Government that they be divided into small parcels and sold, under such restrictions as to quantity and time as will insure the best price and guard more effectually against combinations of capitalists to obtain monopolies.

If Congress had followed the recommendation of President Polk, and the Government had established on a business basis the royalty-leasing principle, such as now prevails in Canada, or if it had followed the recommendation of President Fillmore, and have guarded against combinations of capitalists to obtain monopolies, what a world of trouble would have been saved.

Thus, we see from the very beginning of our Nation the public lands—agricultural, mineral, arid, and semiarid—the waters on and under the earth, and all the resources of the sea and the land have been given away with wanton and reckless prodigality, until much that is most valuable and essential to the Nation's strength has gone into individual or corporate ownership.

The result is that magnificent resources that should have remained under government control for the use, benefit, and enjoyment of the people of this generation and of coming generations have been wasted and uneconomically administered to the enrichment of the few, the impoverishment of the many of today, and unless Congress acts wisely and intelligently the industrial slavery of generations yet unborn.

Mr. LENROOT. Can the gentleman give the total number of acres granted to railroad companies?

Mr. MORSE. I have not the total number of acres, but it was sufficient to more than equal in size two of our great western States.

In this connection I wish to call attention to the establishment in this country of a system of land ownership which has all of the evils of the estates tail of England. While it is true that we can not in this country tie up great landed estates for generations, handing it down from oldest son to oldest son indefinitely, yet the same thing is accomplished by our corporation laws, and the recent large purchases of friar lands in the Philippine Islands and the large timber holdings by the Weyerhaeuser corporations, and the large mineral-land holdings by the Guggenheim corporations, and the steel trust, serve well to illustrate this tendency and its baneful possibilities.

In our hurry to get rid of our great natural resources we have forgotten the danger of monopoly pointed out by Presidents Polk and Fillmore. We can hardly realize the clearness of prophetic vision possessed by Hon. Thomas Ewing, the Secretary of the Interior under Fillmore.

On December 3, 1849, calling the attention of Congress to the discovery of gold in California, he said:

It is due to the Nation at large that this rich deposit of mineral wealth should be made productive, so as to meet, in process of time, the heavy expense incurred in its acquisition. It is also due to those who become the lessees or purchasers of the mines that they should be furnished by the Government with such scientific aid and directions as may enable them to conduct their operations not only to the advantage of the Treasury, but also with convenience and profit to themselves. If sold, these mines will pass at once into the hands of large capitalists; if leased, industrious men without capital may become the proprietors, as they can work the mines and pay the rent out of the proceeds.

I think it is very generally admitted that the foundations of most of the great fortunes of to-day were laid in gifts or sales at but a tithe of their real value of our great natural resources, which should have been distributed to all the people and not to a chosen few.

The foundations of the railroad fortunes were secured by the gift of great tracts of land. One railroad was granted a strip of land consisting of every other section 50 miles wide from Duluth to the coast. Other great slices of our public domain have been given away for similar purposes.

The Rockefellers have had the oil, the Goulds and Vanderbilts the land, the Weyerhaeusers the timber, the Guggenheims the minerals, the steel magnates the iron ore, and a few millionaires have made their fortunes in coal. Outside of Alaska very little of this great national bank account remains in the hands of the Government as trustee for all the people.

The dangers pointed out by Polk and Fillmore fifty years ago have become realities to-day. But no man seemed to see them until Roosevelt came to the presidential chair.

When the historian of fifty years hence looks back through the clear perspective of time and writes the history of the Roosevelt administration he will rearrange in the order of their importance the accomplishments of that administration. Time will clear away the annoying little things, which to our minds seem important to-day, and the great things alone will remain.

This period of history will tell of the Roosevelt audacity in diplomacy in bringing to a close the bloody Russo-Japanese war; it will relate the wonderful moral awakening that took place during his administration, and which was the direct result of his teachings; it will describe the beginning of the struggle of the American people against corporate greed, and for the principle of giving to every laborer a fair share of the fruits of his labor; and above and beyond all these, of transcendent importance and far-reaching moment, the historian will write, in letters large and bold, a chapter entitled "The Conservation of Natural Resources."

I realize fully the many difficult problems both economic and constitutional which surround the question of the conservation of our great natural resources. One is met at every turn by a divided authority which is inherent under our Constitution. It is hard, indeed, to determine where states rights leave off and federal rights commence. It is hard to draw the line between the duties of the State and the responsibility of the General Government in these matters. The twilight zone is very wide.

Many wise men throughout the Nation have commenced to see the necessity of some action, either state or federal, but few, if any, had any real conception of the urgent necessity for legislative action until after the appointment of the Conservation Commission by President Roosevelt, and the publication of some of the preliminary reports of this commission.

I desire to call your attention to the need of some conservation legislation and to some of the facts regarding our natural resources, and to briefly outline my ideas as to the direction that this legislation should take.

I realize that there is a wide divergence of opinion on this subject entertained by those who live in the public-land States and those who live in other sections of the country.

It is said by those who live in the public-land States that the people in the older settled portions of the country should not attempt to dictate the policy of the Government with regard to this public land. My friend from Colorado said to me the other day:

Your people in Wisconsin were permitted to purchase public land at \$1.25 an acre, and the Federal Government did not attempt to withhold it from settlement or withdraw it from sale. You had your public lands, why should not we have ours?

My answer is: First, the fact that we have made a mistake heretofore is no reason for our continuing to act erroneously. A bad precedent is no precedent. Second, I would not permanently withdraw agricultural lands from homestead entry. Third, mineral lands and the stone and timber lands are not proper locations for a homesteader, and the governmental policy of selling public lands for a mere tithe of what they are worth was initiated in the first place and has been continued for the purpose of encouraging the home builder and the poor man, and not for the purpose of encouraging speculation in timber or minerals, or the building of great fortunes.

The question of proper legislation with regard to the conservation of our water powers is difficult and puzzling. The subject divides itself into two parts—first, the question of regulation of power plants on the public domain, and, second, the question of the right of the Government to impose conditions on a company which is granted the privilege of constructing a dam, not on the public domain, but in a navigable stream. Of course, the whole power to so legislate rests on the constitu-

tional provision which gives Congress power to regulate commerce, and the theory of every dam or other obstruction placed in a navigable stream is that it is placed there to aid navigation.

Ex-Secretary Garfield and many able constitutional lawyers take the position that where the Government owns the land on both sides of the stream it has the right to prescribe all rules and regulations necessary for the proper control of power development on these streams. Men who entertain this legal view contend that the Government should exercise this control either through a proper form of lease of the land or by conditions imposed at the time of the sale of the land.

President Roosevelt took the position that the granting of these extremely valuable rights, amounting to monopoly, on navigable streams and on the public domain, without compensation and without restrictions, was positively criminal. In his famous James River veto message he quoted the following language, which he had previously used in the Rainy River veto message, and said:

In place of the present haphazard policy of permanently alienating valuable public property we should substitute a definite policy along the following lines:

First. There should be a limited or carefully guarded grant in the nature of an option or opportunity afforded within reasonable time for development of plans and for execution of the project.

Second. Such a grant or concession should be accompanied in the act making the grant by a provision expressly making it the duty of a designated official to annul the grant if the work is not begun or plans are not carried out in accordance with the authority granted.

Third. It should also be the duty of some designated official to see to it that in approving the plans the maximum development of the navigation and power is assured, or at least that in making the plans these may not be so developed as ultimately to interfere with the better utilization of the water or complete development of the power.

Fourth. There should be a license fee or charge, which, though small or nominal at the outset, can in the future be adjusted so as to secure a control in the interest of the public.

Fifth. Provision should be made for the termination of the grant or privilege at a definite time, leaving to future generations the power or authority to renew or extend the concession in accordance with the conditions which may prevail at that time.

He then adds:

Further reflection suggests a sixth condition, viz: The license should be forfeited upon proof that the licensee has joined in any conspiracy or unlawful combination in restraint of trade, as is provided for grants of coal lands in Alaska by the act of May 28, 1910.

He told how thirteen corporations, centering in the General Electric and the Westinghouse, controlled one-third of the water power of the country, and added:

This astonishing consolidation has taken place practically within the last five years. The movement is still in its infancy, and unless it is controlled the history of the oil industry will be repeated in the hydroelectric power industry, with results far more oppressive and disastrous to the people.

That message was written a year and a half ago, and close students of industrial conditions have seen this same tendency toward consolidation and monopolization advancing during the last eighteen months with an accelerated speed.

If one can judge from the directorates of these great power companies and draw conclusions from the similarity of interests that control, he is led to the conclusion that at least 50 per cent of the developed horsepower of the country is now controlled by one group of financiers; furthermore, this percentage does not reveal the whole truth.

These powers naturally represent a majority of the best power sites. Hon. Herbert Knox Smith, the Commissioner of Corporations, says:

These sites are strategic points for large power and market control, and should these strategic sites be coupled up "they become still more strategic." There are powerful economic reasons for such coupling. The great problem of water-power companies is that of the "uneven load," and not only an uneven load, but of an uneven source of power because of the fluctuating flow of the stream. Coupling is rapidly in progress in the United States. The Niagara Falls Power Company and the Canadian Niagara Power Company are coupled; the Southern Power Company, in North Carolina and South Carolina; the Commonwealth Power Company, in Michigan; the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, the Pacific Light and Power Company, and the Edison Electric Company, in California. Each concern has its various developments coupled up into one unit.

With these startling facts staring us in the face we have done nothing to protect the people from the inevitable results of this concentration.

President Taft, on April 17, 1908, when he was Secretary of War, said:

In the execution of any project, and as incidental to, and inseparably connected with the improvement of navigation, the power of Congress extends to the regulation of the use and development of the waters for purposes subsidiary to navigation.

I believe that the Government has this power, and I am certain that it should exercise it. We are threatened by this monopoly, and unless we take steps to control it now, in a very few years it will attain gigantic proportions. It will dictate to the next generation terms of sale, and when coal nears exhaustion will from one great financial center name the terms

upon which the citizen can conduct his business and the laborer earn his livelihood.

I am firmly convinced then that the recommendations of President Roosevelt should be carried out, and that the Government should at this time retain title to all of the public land on which there are water-power sites, and that an investigation should be made and careful study given to the problem in order that we may determine the wisest course to pursue in the future.

I wish to call your attention to the matter of the conservation of our mineral resources and the necessity for legislation having for its object the conservation of these resources.

The Government maintains at great expense a bureau which we call the Geological Survey. Hundreds of men are constantly employed and millions of dollars have been spent in surveying the public lands and locating, charting, and valuing the minerals which lie hidden beneath the surface. These great natural resources of iron, coal, copper, lead, zinc, gold, and silver belong to all of the people of this Nation. The Government is the trustee, and should administer this trust for the benefit not of a chosen few, but rather for the benefit of all the people of this Nation.

President Polk pointed out the great danger of turning this immense national-bank account over to any who might ask for it without any reservation or restriction whatever.

Pretty nearly every President from his time to the present day has called the attention of Congress to the many glaring defects in our mining laws, but everybody has been so busy attending to his own business that nobody has attended to everybody's business. In the meantime the Rockefellers have gone on gathering up the oil; the Weyerhaeusers, the timber; the steel trust, the iron ore; the Guggenheims, the copper; various railroad companies control the coal not on the public land, and the Morgan syndicate has now practically gotten control of nearly half of the developed water power of the country.

All of this has been accomplished while these people were acting, very largely at least, within the letter of the law.

President Roosevelt again and again urged Congress to take some action looking toward the prevention of the monopolization of the Nation's fuel supply. He urged the leasing system and the retention in the Government of the title to the minerals.

The officers of the Geological Survey have recently raised the price of much of the coal lands upon the public domain, and it is quite generally believed, even by Members of Congress, that this has stopped the sale of these lands, but such is not the case. I quote from Geological Survey Bulletin 424, just published:

It may be of interest to note that the higher prices placed on government coal lands do not seem to have decreased their sale, but rather the contrary. Thus it is stated that when the new government prices were first announced there was a general expression of doubt as to the sale of the lands, and the prediction was freely made that the new prices would actually tie up their sale.

The sales have increased rather than decreased. The writer visited the office in Salt Lake City, October 1, 1909, and found that in the preceding month 27 sales had been made, ranging from 40 to 160 acres, at an average price of \$48 per acre, bringing into the office during the month a total of over \$200,000; that 50 declaratory statements have been made and 5 cash entries.

Thus, in Wyoming coal-declaratory statements have been made on four quarter sections in each of two townships, in one of which the prices range from \$370 to \$410 and in the other from \$225 to \$430 per acre.

Many well-informed Members of Congress seem to think that the coal lands on the public domain are now tied up and are not passing into private ownership, but the reverse is true. If we are going to inaugurate a new policy with regard to this fuel supply we must do it now. It will do no good to lock the door after the horse is stolen. Thirty-five million nine hundred and fifteen thousand two hundred and twenty-five acres of coal lands have recently been classified and restored to entry.

There are many advantages in the leasing system. The Government can impose such conditions as it sees fit. The lessees can be compelled to adopt up-to-date safety devices. The conditions of labor can be controlled. The hours of labor regulated and the frightful conditions which now prevail in the coal mines of Pennsylvania and West Virginia can be very easily remedied. Child labor can be abolished, and the lessees can be compelled to sell the product to the public at a reasonable price, and, under the terms of our interstate-commerce law which we are now adopting, the cost of the transportation of the coal can be regulated.

I do not believe the Government should charge a large price for this coal; in fact, I would be in favor of selling it for a mere nominal sum, simply enough to pay the cost of supervision, because the more the lessee is compelled to pay, the higher will be the price to the consumer.

I am firmly convinced that if this policy had been followed from the beginning, the people in my district would be saving at least 25 per cent on their fuel bills, and the labor conditions in the coal mines to-day would be much better than they are.

My friend from Minnesota says that this is socialistic. My good friend from New Jersey says that it is paternalistic. I care not what you call it, nor am I afraid of the tendency of this kind of legislation. If this is socialistic, Theodore Roosevelt, ex-Secretary Garfield, President Taft, and Secretary Ballinger are all Socialists.

Everyone is familiar with the views of Colonel Roosevelt and Mr. Garfield on this subject. Let me quote a few sentences from the message of President Taft at the beginning of the Sixtieth Congress:

In my judgment, the Government should have the right to keep the fee of the coal, oil, and gas fields in its possession and lease the right to develop them under proper restrictions. The present limitations have been absurd, excessive, and serve no useful purpose, and often render it necessary that there should be either fraud or else abandonment of the work of getting out the coal.

Secretary Ballinger takes the same position, and in his annual report ending June 30, 1910, he says:

As regards new legislation, the present coal-land laws respecting the States and Territories, as well as Alaska, should be supplanted by an act fully meeting existing as well as future conditions. The inducements for much of the crime and fraud, both constructive and actual, committed under the present system can be prevented by separating the right to mine from the title to the soil. The surface would thereby be open to entry under other laws according to its character and subject to the right to extract the coal.

The object to be attained in any such legislation is to conserve the coal deposits as a public utility and to prevent monopoly or extortion in their disposition. This may be accomplished either through a leasing system, by which the title would remain in the Government, under proper regulation and supervision by the Secretary of the Interior, or through the sale of the deposits, and in either case with restrictions on their mining and use which would control the minimum output and conserve the deposits as a public utility. I believe the most advantageous method will be found in a measure authorizing the lease or sale of the coal deposits in the lands, subject to forfeiture for failure to exercise the rights granted, under such reasonable regulations as may be imposed.

And while it may not be a very valuable exercise, yet it is an interesting one to speculate as to the probable time of the exhaustion of all of our coal. While we have accurate information as to the amount of coal that is used each year, we have only a very rough estimate of the amount of coal still in the land.

According to Geological Survey Bulletin 394 the production of coal during the year 1907 was over 480,000,000 tons:

In order to reach even an approximate idea of the length of time that this coal supply will last it is necessary in the first place to estimate the probable annual production in the future. That it will increase beyond the present maximum goes without saying, but at what rates and for how long a period will the increase continue are questions whose solutions can only be guessed.

It is necessary, therefore, in order to obtain rates of increase which are fairly comparable with one another, that we take the rate of production for periods sufficiently long to include a period of prosperity with one of business depression, i. e., twenty years. This has been done with the following results, expressed in terms of millions of tons, each the production of twenty years, with percentages of increase.

Production of coal and rate of increase, by twenty-year periods, 1828 to 1907.

Years.	Production.	Increase.
		Per cent.
1828-1847.....	37.3	
1848-1867.....	308.0	730
1868-1887.....	1,451.0	374
1888-1907.....	5,068.0	249

As is seen above, the easily accessible coal may be exhausted about the year 2040, and all coal about the middle of that century.

It must not be supposed, however, that this programme will be carried out. In the first place, the data upon which this curve has been constructed are very few, and the curve is correspondingly weak.

Of course many other influences will come in. As the coal nears exhaustion the price will increase, the development of water powers will have an influence, the economies to be introduced in mining and many other influences will work to lengthen the life of our coal supply.

Much that I have said with regard to the coal applies equally well to petroleum. Varying with the compactness of the "pay sand" and with the pressure of the gas accompanying the petroleum, the productive life of wells continues between the extreme limits of a few months, on the one hand, to more than twenty years, on the other. The experience of petroleum producers shows that the average life of a well in Pennsylvania is seven years; in the mid-continent fields, about the same; in Texas, four; and in California, six years.

The total production of petroleum in the whole country was in—

	Barrels.
1860	500, 000
1870	5, 000, 000
1880	26, 000, 000
1890	45, 000, 000
1900	65, 000, 000
1908	170, 000, 000

I quote from Geological Bulletin 394:

The rate of petroleum production, graphically portrayed in the curve on Plate IV, shows that, beginning with 1860, as much petroleum has been produced in each nine years as the entire product preceding this nine years. Continuing this rate of increase, the next nine years would produce 1,800,000,000 barrels, making the total amount extracted up to 1916, 3,600,000,000 barrels.

In 1925 the amount extracted would reach 7,200,000,000, and in 1934, 14,400,000,000 barrels, and nine years more, 1943, would bring the total to almost the maximum amount estimated as obtainable from the present fields. Concerning the probability of such a rate of increase in production, one must consider the causes for the great increase in past years. The vital factor has been the ease with which any quantity of oil could be sold for cash at any time and for prices ordinarily much above the cost of production. This ready market has not been seriously disturbed even by the greatly increased production of the past years. The second reason is based upon the liquid character of the product. With the discovery of each new field, the territory is divided into many leaseholdings, frequently small in size. In pumping from one lease petroleum is apt to flow in from a rival interest. It is therefore necessary for each lessee to "get his share" before it flows away to drained territory. It is impossible to prevent the consequent rapid depletion of a field without a combination of all the interests, or by limiting by statute the amount that each producer shall extract per acre within a specified time. General industrial conditions have had little effect in regulating the production of petroleum, as has been the case with coal. The purchaser for cash has always been on hand. Even if the price paid has been low, it has been above the cost of production. The surplus has been readily marketed abroad or burned as a substitute for coal.

Regarding the limits of time within which the present supply will be exhausted, it is clear that, considering the minimum quantity of petroleum in the United States as 15,000,000,000 barrels and continuing the present rate of increase in production, the supply would be exhausted about 1935. If the present annual production were continued without increase, ninety years would be required to exhaust this estimated minimum quantity.

A reasonable view of the situation makes it probable that the present annual rate of production will be increased slightly through the developments of Illinois, Oklahoma, and California, but that within a very few years a marked decline will be noted, and this will continue, with increasing value for the oil product and an insufficient quantity for the legitimate demands of the industry after another decade, and that the production, on a reduced scale, will continue for a long time, but in an amount unsatisfactory to industrial necessity, except as supplemented from new fields.

The same authorities that I have quoted in favor of the leasing of coal lands also favor the leasing of government-owned oil lands, and the same reasoning applies.

Of course, everyone knows that competition has practically ceased in the oil business and the country is at the mercy of the Standard Oil Company. No one need delude himself with the hope that if the Supreme Court declares the combination unlawful healthy, honest competition will ensue. If the company is dissolved, other means will be found to accomplish the same ends.

Thousands of acres of oil lands are still a part of the public domain. These lands should be at once withdrawn from entry and not again restored until some method can be devised to enforce healthy, honest competition, or at least to protect the public from the extortions that are now practiced. I do not believe in having the Government do anything that can be done as well or as cheaply by private enterprise. I do believe in encouraging, in every way possible, individual effort, but in the encouragement of the individual we should not deliver the whole American people over to a trust, to be exploited and robbed, even if the beneficiary does endow a great university or build a few libraries with the income on his illegally gotten plunder.

If we are going to retain the remainder of our oil in the hands of the Government for the benefit of all we must act now, and act effectively. It is easier to dictate terms while we still own the property than to do so after it has passed entirely out of our control.

If we can not agree on a policy let us stop all sales now and then make a careful study of the problem. No harm can come from this, and the people from whom we are acting will lose nothing while the door is locked.

Secretary Ballinger has recently withdrawn temporarily, for the purpose of submitting the subject to Congress for new legislation, 3,621,062 acres of oil lands. I quote from his report for the year ending June 30, 1909, as follows:

I desire to call attention to the importance of asking Congress to authorize the Executive to reserve certain areas of these lands for the purpose of affording a supply of fuel oil for the future use of the navy, and to make such regulations as may be necessary for the preservation and extraction of such deposits.

No legislation exists for the entry of oil lands and gas lands other than the general mining laws, which are not adaptable, and it is the duty of Congress to act now on this matter. We

are doing absolutely nothing, or, at least, I have heard of nothing being done. I have carefully examined the calendar, and I am unable to find any bills reported out of the Committee on Public Lands having this end in view.

At this time it may be well to call attention to the rapid depletion of the phosphate in our soil and the need for conservation legislation along this line. Doctor Van Hise, the president of the University of Wisconsin, has again and again pointed out the fact that a large amount of our precious phosphate deposits are being exported to Europe to enrich the worn-out farm lands of the old countries.

Every intelligent farmer knows the value of these phosphates in chemical fertilizers.

These deposits are found in paying quantities in four places in this country. Phosphate rock is found in South Carolina, where the production is rapidly falling off and the supply is nearing exhaustion; second, it is found in western Florida, where the deposits are being mined very rapidly; third, it is found in Tennessee, where the supply is almost untouched; and, fourth, on the public domain in the corners of Idaho, Wyoming, and Utah, where these three States touch.

The estimated tonnage is as follows:

South Carolina	3, 000, 000
Florida	15, 000, 000
Tennessee	103, 500, 000
The Western States	100, 000, 000
Total	221, 500, 000

The Franco-American Consolidated Phosphate Company has purchased a controlling interest in the Tennessee fields, and this will largely be exported, as this is a foreign corporation, and the rock was purchased for the purpose of export.

The amount mined each year is rapidly increasing. The production in 1907 was 2,225,000 tons, and 40 per cent of the total production is annually exported. Thus it is seen that the phosphate deposits of the United States are to be drained for the benefit of the worn-out farm lands of foreign countries.

If all the lands containing phosphates were reserved pending legislation, it would remove from entry certain lands which might otherwise be occupied by homesteaders, and it is therefore necessary to provide for the disposal of the surface rights alone.

Says Secretary Ballinger:

There are over 4,000,000 acres of phosphate lands temporarily withdrawn. The lands containing phosphate are not adaptable to disposition, and should not be allowed to be disposed of as either placer or lode mineral claims, but the deposits should be leased or sold in limited areas, and on conditions preventing monopoly and insuring domestic use.

I am calling the attention of my brother Congressmen to this necessity for immediate legislation on account of the fact that a great deal of adverse criticism has arisen on account of the so-called impracticability of many of the schemes of those who believe in conservation. Here are some practical conservation ideas that can be very easily carried out and a world of good result from their enactment into law. Many bills have been introduced and a large part of them referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

The need of some kind of forestry legislation is recognized by everyone, but it seems to be almost impossible to get a majority of this House to agree on the kind of legislation needed. The Forest Service, under the leadership of Mr. Pinchot and Mr. Graves, has done and still is doing a magnificent work.

Various bills have been introduced here having for their object the establishment of great national forest reserves in the Appalachian and White mountains. I think that it is pretty generally conceded that the General Government can not, under the Constitution as it now exists, go into this work, except it be in aid of navigation.

In the interest of economic management and administration I am firmly convinced that the States should do this work, if possible. Wisconsin has set a magnificent example, and one that should be generally followed. But the conditions in New England are quite different.

Economic, geographical, and industrial conditions do not observe state lines. Rivers, mountains, and rainfall pay no attention to boundaries between States, and therein lies the difficulty. A river takes its rise in one State, flows through another, where it is used for developing power, and through still another, where it is useful for commerce, and carries on its bosom the products of several States, and is used largely for the transportation of articles in interstate commerce.

The citizens of the first State do not feel that it is fair to compel them to bear the whole expense of the establishment and maintenance of great forest reserves in that State which will inure largely to the benefit of the people of the second and third States and indirectly to the benefit of the citizens of the

several States. The legislature of Connecticut would not be justified in appropriating money for the purchase of large tracts of land in Vermont and New Hampshire unless Connecticut had some voice in the expenditure of the money and the management of the reserves when purchased and unless it could receive its equitable share of the profits from the sale of the timber.

If we do not decide to appropriate money out of the National Treasury for the establishment of national reserves in these mountains, we certainly ought to enact a law that will allow the various States to establish joint reserves. This is the least that we can in good conscience do, and, in my opinion, we should do this at this session.

I would like to go into the question at greater length, but on account of the fact that my time as well as your patience is limited I must refrain.

In a short time, as we count time in the life of a nation, we have all but reached the end of the mighty forests that formerly shaded one-third of this continent. We have now reached the point where we have in store timber for only thirty or thirty-five years at the present rate of cutting. A timber famine is fast approaching, and when it comes it will touch with a heavy hand every man, woman, and child in all the land. It will affect the daily life of every one of us, and yet, without thought, without foresight, we have placed ourselves in a position where a timber famine is one of the inevitable results of the near future.

We must remember that we are legislating not for to-day alone, but that we are engaged in the mighty work of nation building. A hundred years is but a day in the life of a nation. It is eight hundred and fifty years since William the Conqueror landed in England, and she is still a young nation. Two thousand eight hundred years ago Homer sang of Achilles and Odysseus, of Paris and of Helen, and the descendants of the Greeks of his time still live. King Chufu built the great pyramid four thousand years ago, and the descendants of his people still inhabit the plains of Egypt and water their flocks and herds in the same Nile that Tennyson makes Cleopatra say—would have risen before his time and flooded at our nod.

There is a very dangerous piece of legislation now pending in the coordinate branch of this Government. I refer to Senate bill 7432. The intent of this bill is to transfer to the public-lands States all powers and responsibilities of the National Government with respect to water-power development on land owned by the Nation.

If the Government is going to assume any responsibility in this matter for the well-being of the Nation and the protection of the individual we must kill this bill.

The Constitution, Article IV, section 3, gives us the power to make all needful rules and regulations concerning the territory and other public-land property of the United States. None but cowards will shirk this duty or dodge this responsibility.

Possibly these matters ought to be left to the States, if the States could control them in the interest of the people. But they have failed utterly in the past, and from the very nature of the case the business, being largely interstate business, must fail in the future.

My friend from Wyoming asks, "Do you wish to make of us a federal province?"

He will find that the General Government wherein his people have representation will give him a better administration of the people's wealth that still remains in public ownership than some water-power trust with headquarters in New York City, or some coal trust with headquarters at Denver. And besides, we must remember that the national domain belongs to the Nation and not to certain States.

Says Secretary Ballinger:

It is to be regretted that we, as a Nation, were so tardy to realize the importance of preventing so large a measure of our natural resources passing into the hands of land pirates and speculators, with no view to development looking to the national welfare.

These great natural resources of coal, oil, timber, phosphates, and water power belong to all the people of this Nation and not to a chosen few, or to the people of a half dozen sparsely settled States. The Nation is the trustee for all, and we, as national legislators, are acting for all. We must act promptly and wisely and have no fear of being called socialists or paternalists or nationalists. No one but the General Government can control interstate corporations, and we all know that even Uncle Sam has not made a signal success of the job. I say to you fellow-Republicans that an indignant electorate will quickly replace us and turn the task over to another party if we fail in our plain duty.

I am appending hereto copies of letters received from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, the first giving cer-

tain data as to coal-land entries, the second giving information with regard to recoveries of coal lands which have been fraudulently secured:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, May 6, 1910.

Hon. E. A. MORSE,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In response to your verbal request for information as to the recoveries of valuable coal lands brought about through the efforts of the field service force of this office, I take pleasure in submitting the following figures, which show what has been done along that line. Some of the lands which have been recovered, or for which suits have been recommended and are now pending, were entered under the coal-land laws by means of dummy entrymen, and part of the lands were entered under the agricultural land laws, the purpose being to secure these valuable coal lands by concealment of the mineral value thereof. During the year 1907 there was recovered through suit 1,120 acres; during the year 1908 the recovered land amounted to 1,600 acres; and in the year 1909 13,744 acres were recovered.

During the calendar year 1908 suits were recommended to the Department of Justice involving 9,760 acres and in 1908 suits were recommended involving 22,260 acres.

In addition to the foregoing there has recently been submitted to the department offers of compromise which, if accepted, will restore to the public domain 80,045 acres of coal land, the value of which is estimated at \$1,407,176.80.

Very respectfully,

FRED DENNETT, Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, May 5, 1910.

MISCELLANEOUS STATISTICS.

Hon. E. A. MORSE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR SIR: Pursuant to your verbal request, the following data as to coal entries is furnished:

Sales of coal land.

Fiscal year—	Number of entries.	Acres.	Amount.
1905.....	158	20,456.85	\$277,402.40
1906.....	244	42,143.39	538,683.70
1907.....	187	25,158.81	350,973.54
1908.....	303	49,821.12	626,663.18
1909.....	213	31,045.12	556,502.08
Total (five years).....	1,105	168,624.79	2,350,224.85

Very respectfully,

FRED DENNETT, Commissioner.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL].

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, last Saturday, May 7, was the seventy-fourth birthday of the Speaker of this House. On that day the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] referred to the occasion in most felicitous and appropriate words. It was a remarkably graceful tribute to the Speaker of this House from the man who would be Speaker—and would be a most excellent Speaker should he ever be called upon to exercise the functions of that exalted office. [Applause.] I think the one thing that would most nearly reconcile me to the change in the control of this House which the gentleman from Missouri so hopefully and so frequently predicts would be the attainment by him of the honorable ambition of his life. [Applause.]

The occasion, and the remarks by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] last Saturday, were alluded to by one of the great New York papers, the New York Sun, of the 11th instant, in an editorial of so much interest that I think it deserves to be given the widest possible circulation. I will ask to have the Clerk read it in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, it will be read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

A CALL TO MR. CANNON.

We must own to a feeling of disappointment that the Hon. JOSEPH GURNEY CANNON in returning thanks to the leader of the minority in the House on Saturday for his congratulations, in the name of all, upon the Speaker's attaining his seventy-fourth birthday, did not respond to the Hon. CHAMP CLARK's suggestion that he round out his career by writing a book of reminiscences. "You have known," said Mr. CLARK, "every President of the United States, beginning with one of the greatest of them, Abraham Lincoln. You have been acquainted with every distinguished public man in America for four decades and with many from abroad. I never saw any man in my life who could relate a reminiscence with more skill and felicity than you can."

All of this is true, and Mr. CLARK might have added that Uncle Joe's origin, bringing up, self-education, early struggles, emergence from poverty, experience at the bar, entrance to public life, and rise to distinction would supply him with such a variety of incident and wealth of local color that the narrative, lighted up by his humor and shaded by his shrewdness, would be vastly entertaining as well as historically informing. The Quakers would perhaps be inclined to disown Mr. CANNON to-day on account of his salty speech and free and easy philosophy of life, but before the sectarians left Nantucket Mr. CANNON's fore-

bears prayed with the Coffins, the Starbucks, and Macys in the prim little church hard by the museum filled with relics of the whale fisheries over which the summer visitor now lingers. Uncle JOE really began life as a Quaker down in Guilford, N. C., in 1836, but there was Irish blood in him and he did not stay orthodox very long. That was a migrating period, and his boyhood was spent on the banks of the Wabash.

Doing chores and selling plug tobacco, calico, and stick candy in a country store consumed the youth's time until he was 20. Until he was 16 he never saw a railroad train. Uncle JOE should be able to rival Mark Twain in his stories of his playmates and the characters of that remote Indiana village of a few hundred homespun folk. Then he began to read law by a tallow dip, if not by a pine knot. He took to politics early, and at his first convention he saw gaunt Abraham Lincoln and heard him make a speech, with a setting of rails he had split. Then came the Douglas-Lincoln debates. Young CANNON listened to them and despaired of ever making a figure in public life. What a chapter he could write of those rough-and-ready times, of his budding ambitions, and his first law cases. He hung out his shingle in 1856 in Douglas County, Ill.—another migration. Again he moved, this time to Vermillion County, of which he became state attorney in the first year of the civil war, retaining the office for several years, exciting and eventful for the country and formative for JOE CANNON, who may have had his reasons for keeping out of the war and sticking to his law; it would be interesting to hear them. Early in the seventies he found his way to Congress, and there he has been ever since, with an intermission of only two years.

Thirty years in Congress, Mr. CANNON has rubbed shoulders and matched wits with the best and worst men of a generation, and with his insight, humor, love of truth, and hatred of cant and false sentiment, what graphic and tolerant sketches he could give of them. It would be a postbellum history of laws in the making and reputations in the gaining and losing. "There," President Roosevelt once said, pointing to the Speaker, "sits a man who has risen to a position of great eminence and power in our public life and whose hand has never touched an unclean dollar!" A proper tribute, and what sidelights Uncle JOE could give us on the real Roosevelt! For that matter, how he could dissect and visualize the public men of the period, of some of whom we have a false perspective and others of whom wear halos belonging to unpraised men and have no right to their pedestals.

Full of years and of youth, ripe in wisdom, with troops of friends and some enemies in whom he is honored, a human and therefore imperfect figure, but withal a typical American, proud of his country and devoted to it, what an admirable biographer and commentator JOSEPH GURNEY CANNON would make! He should not be allowed to escape the task and the responsibility.

[Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

[Mr. NELSON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP].

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself briefly to the mine-rescue work recently undertaken by the Government through the Interior Department. As stated in a pamphlet issued by the Geological Survey, the attention of the Government has only recently been directed to the need and importance of work of this character. The first appropriation was made in July, 1908, and as a result one federal station and three branch stations have been established. It is too early to judge of the results accomplished, but the objects in view are such as should inspire the greatest interest on the part of Congress. The protection of human life and the conservation of our national resources, the principal objects to be accomplished, should be given most serious regard. In the concentration of our minds upon business we may not realize that 2,061 miners were killed and 4,800 injured, a total of 6,861, in the coal mines of the United States in 1906; that in 1907 there were 8,925 miners thus killed and injured; and in 1908 there were 2,450 miners killed and probably 6,000 injured, although statistics of the exact number of injured are not available. Thus in three years 7,636 able-bodied miners lost their lives in producing the Nation's fuel supply, and 16,600 were injured, many of them disabled for life, and certainly lost as productive factors in the social organization.

Disregarding the mental anguish of those who are suddenly deprived of the head of their household and their chief means of support, this loss in the Nation's productive energy is a most distressing condition, and should be minimized as far as possible. The work of the miner is dangerous, but necessary. It is probably the most hazardous of all occupations, but it is an occupation on which almost every manufacturing enterprise as well as the comfort of millions of people are dependent. His sphere of activity is usually limited to his mining camp, but he is contributing to the world's wealth and the world's necessities as much or more than any class of laborers.

In foreign countries the loss of life in coal mines is very much less than the loss in this country. Owing to a different classification of miners, it is impossible to give accurate comparisons fair to both countries, but apparently for every man killed in a mine in Belgium more than three men lose their lives in this country, though it is claimed that mining conditions in this country are relatively far more favorable; in both Great Britain and France, where problems of ventilation are more difficult of solution than in our mines, one man is lost while we lose three. It is shown also that not only the total loss per year is increas-

ing, but also the percentage of loss per year is increasing. In other words, for every 1,000 men employed in the coal mines of the United States a greater percentage of men were killed in 1908 than in 1904, and more per 1,000 were killed in 1904 than in 1900, and so on, as far back as we have data available.

The difference between this and other countries in respect to loss of life seems to be directly traceable to the establishment of rescue experimental stations in other countries. Scientific men are there engaged in the study of explosives, in methods of mining, and in the invention and selection of apparatus suitable for use when an explosion actually occurs.

By disseminating information thus gained, the miner is better equipped to fight for his life in cases of emergency, and the operator is assisted in throwing better safeguards around the lives of his employees, as well as securing better protection to his property interests; public sentiment is at the same time awakened to more diligent study of the problems, with the result as above stated. Take Belgium, for example: In 1880 the loss of life per 1,000 miners employed was 2.36, while in 1906 it was only 1.02. Contrast that with this country: In 1895, for every 1,000 miners employed the loss was 2.67, yet in 1907 it had increased to 4.86 for every 1,000 men so employed.

It can scarcely be doubted that similar work prosecuted more generally than is being done in this country would bring about similar results. The Government is already engaged in it, and therefore the only question to be determined is the extent to which its operations will extend in order to secure the best results. The Director of the Geological Survey has recommended to Congress the establishment of nine new branch stations, and asks for an appropriation for this purpose. I want to place myself on record as being in favor of this legislation, and I trust that the number will be increased beyond the recommendation of the director. I realize that objections are made almost to every increase in appropriations on the ground of economy. I realize also that the purpose of those who favor economy in government expenditures is undoubtedly worthy, yet there are two great purposes to be accomplished by this appropriation—one the protection of human life, and the other the preservation in large measure of our coal supply. The amount seems to me small as compared with the benefits to be derived, not only by the individuals involved, but by the community at large. As the Director of the Survey says, the Government work should be along the same lines as is pursued in the Agricultural Department in the establishment of experimental stations and the demonstrations of better methods of farming.

In a letter from the Director of the Survey, embodied in Senate Document No. 226, is set out the reasons for the results and the scope of the department's work connected with these rescue and experiment stations. I quote from Secretary of the Interior as follows:

As to the action that the Federal Government should take to prevent or at least minimize mine accidents, it is assumed that in mining, as in agriculture, the function of the Federal Government is strictly limited to research and educational or demonstration work, and therefore its function in relation to safeguarding the lives of miners must be limited to investigations of the causes and means of preventing mine accidents, developing methods of rescue work, and enough of demonstration or educational work to induce mine operators and miners to adopt these measures, under State supervision, and to lead the States to enact more uniform mining regulations.

In my judgment every important general coal field in the United States should have one of these branch stations. The Government of the United States is already expending large sums of money in enterprises connected with saving and protection of human life.

The Steamboat-Inspection Service of the Government is operated at an annual cost of about \$500,000, and so effective is this service that of the great number of passengers transported last year only 124 lost their lives in a way that can be charged to "accident, collision, or foundering."

This bill carries an appropriation of \$2,037,040 for light-house stations and rescue work incident thereto, and no one questions the wisdom of keeping effective this splendid service. An additional \$20,000 is appropriated for a new station.

The safety appliances required by Congress of common carriers has reduced the number of men killed per 1,000 men employed from 1 for every 349 in 1893 to 1 for every 983 in 1908.

Mr. Chairman, in the United States there are now employed as coal miners about 700,000 men. The number of people dependent upon them for support would be, I suppose, at least 4 to 1, so that not only the lives of the miners, but the support of nearly 3,000,000 people is involved. An expenditure of about \$200,000 additional per annum is all that would be required by the department, and it would seem that the Government can not appropriate this small amount more wisely than in work of this kind, when it has been demonstrated that human life is

saved and property interests protected thereby. This work will, of course, be taken up by the Bureau of Mines recently established by this Government, and I have no doubt the director of the bureau will respond to the great public demand for the better protection of the lives of our miners in proceeding at once to the establishment of new stations. I ask permission to insert in my remarks newspaper reports of recent mine disasters, report on a mine fire, and requirements of a breathing apparatus; and letters from the Director of the Geological Survey.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Washington, January 29, 1910.

Hon. C. BASCOM SLEMP,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In response to your recent verbal request for further descriptive information concerning the mine rescue investigation station that might be established in southwestern Virginia, I have brought together the necessary data and submit the same to you as follows:

The housing for such a station should consist of a building, preferably of brick, about 36 by 38 feet, two stories high, with a one-story training room 20 by 36 feet, all of which it is estimated will cost about \$4,000. The furnishing of such a station, together with the necessary outfit for the development of heat, light, and water supply, the fitting of the necessary quarters for two men, putting in partitions, cabinets, and other furnishing, about \$2,000; and, as a third item, the equipment for the station in the way of oxygen helmets and other apparatus would cost approximately as follows:

6 rescue apparatuses, complete	\$750.00
1 telephone helmet	200.00
1 oxygen pump	150.00
300 potash regenerators	255.00
1 reviving cabinet, automatic	115.00
3 reviving devices, portable	53.00
1 field telephone with 3,000 feet wire cable	75.00
1 Orsat gas apparatus	60.00
3 thermometers, self-registering	6.00
6 safety lamps	30.00
6 electric storage lamps	75.00
6 electric flash lamps	7.50
3 charging devices for electric lamps	25.00
1 work recording machine	25.00
1 portable (collapsible) cage	200.00
6 oxygen storage tanks	120.00
10 boxes for transporting apparatus	100.00
12 fire-fighting chemical containers	18.00
Total	2,264.50

The cost of maintenance of the station after it had been established for one year would be approximately as follows:

1 mining engineer	\$2,500
1 assistant	1,500
Supplies for rescue apparatus	800
Repairs to rescue apparatus	100
Transportation of apparatus to and from mines	400
Heat, light, and water	200
Transportation and subsistence of engineer and assistant in field	600
Clerical assistance	400
Total	6,500

If you should desire further description of the building, together with plans for the same, these will be furnished you in more detail. The above estimate includes no estimate as to the cost of the ground for such a station, as it is believed that in any locality within the mining region of southwestern Virginia decided upon for the location the ground would be supplied without charge.

Very respectfully, GEO. OTIS SMITH, Director.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Washington, March 16, 1910.

Hon. C. BASCOM SLEMP,
House of Representatives.

SIR: As per your verbal request this morning, I am sending you herewith two additional copies of the Director's letters to you, dated January 29 and February 3. I am also sending with these one blueprint (the only copy the Washington office has in hand) of a general plan for a small rescue-station building.

As was stated in the Director's letter to you February 3, special plans for the building of such a station can not be drawn until there is a full knowledge as to the character of the location, but this drawing will be useful as giving an idea of the general plan of such a station.

Trusting that this will be satisfactory, I am,
Yours, very respectfully, H. C. RIZER,
Acting Director.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Washington, February 3, 1910.

Hon. C. BASCOM SLEMP,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Following up our conference of yesterday, and supplementing my letter to you of January 29:

The detailed drawings for the building in which a mine rescue station of southwestern Virginia could be housed can not well be satisfactorily prepared until the minor details with regard to the exact location of the station have been settled. Furthermore, all of the mining engineers of this survey who have been assisting in preparing such plans are now either in Colorado or Illinois conducting special investigations following mine disasters in these two States, and even if the exact location of the station was understood, the survey would still be unable to prepare these details for you until these experts return to the station at Pittsburg.

The normal mode of procedure, however, will be to use as a basis of your plans the estimates contained in my letter of January 29, as to the cost and general outlines of the station, and as soon as the question of its exact location has been determined the survey can then easily prepare for you the working plans and specifications which can be used in the erection of the building.

Referring to the Report of the Secretary of the Interior to the Senate, submitted on December 20 last, you will see that in response to the Senate inquiry as to "the number of federal stations essential to the proper safeguarding of life which should be established in the mine fields" in addition to the three stations already established, the Secretary recommended the establishment of nine additional stations, to be distributed at certain strategic points centrally located with reference to the larger coal fields and within easy reach of these coal fields, because of the advantages at each of these places of suitable transportation facilities. In this report it was recommended that one of these additional stations should be located at some point near the boundary between southern Ohio, southwestern West Virginia, and northeastern Kentucky, readily accessible to the coal fields of each of these three regions.

Having recommended the location of this station, in addition to the one already located at Knoxville, to serve the middle portion of the northern Appalachian coal field, this department can not consistently urge the establishment of an additional federal station in the southwestern Virginia coal field. For several similar cases there has been recommended the mode of procedure which I suggest here as perhaps applicable to the proposal for a station in southwestern Virginia, viz: That a group of the larger coal operators in that field arrange for the erection at some point easily accessible to the more important mining centers of a building suitable for such a station and provide the necessary equipment at a cost not to exceed that mentioned and itemized in my letter to you of January 29. If this station can be located at some one of the larger coal mines, it can be cared for by some one of the underofficials connected with the coal company operating at that point, and the miners not only from adjacent mines, but also from the other mines, can go to this station for occasional short training periods.

The Geological Survey will cooperate in this arrangement by keeping at the station one of its experts in rescue methods during such periods as may be found necessary for the training work. Furthermore, the experts in charge of the central government station for mine-rescue investigations can keep in touch with this station, furnishing it from time to time the latest information concerning improved equipment and methods, and thus render every possible assistance and encouragement to the work. It looks now as though a number of stations for ordinary rescue work will, during the next year, be established in different parts of the country on a basis similar to this now proposed, and I submit this plan for your consideration as to the station in southwestern Virginia, believing that you will find it a good working basis.

In whatever way the station in southwestern Virginia may be established, whenever you are ready to proceed with the construction of the station one of the Geological Survey experts will not only prepare for you the plans and specifications, but will also superintend for you, if you so desire, the details connected with the selection and installation of the equipment.

Appreciating fully your interest in this matter, I am,

Very respectfully,

GEO. OTIS SMITH, Director.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Washington, April 14, 1910.

Hon. C. BASCOM SLEMP,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SLEMP: In compliance with your telephonic request of Mr. Parker, I have pleasure in furnishing you herewith such statistics as are available regarding the number of employees, fatal and nonfatal accidents, and the tonnage raised per accident and per fatality in the mining of coal. The figures for the United States are taken from the annual report, Mineral Resources of the United States; those for Great Britain, the German Empire, and Austria are from the official report of the British home office; for France they are from Statistique de L'Industrie Minière et des Appareils à Vapeur en France; and for Belgium they are taken from Statistique des Industries Extractives et Métallurgiques et des Appareils à Vapeur en Belgique. The statistics for the United States and Great Britain cover the calendar year 1908, while those for the other countries are for 1907, that being the latest year for which figures are obtainable.

UNITED STATES.

During 1908 the total production of coal in the United States amounted to 415,842,698 short tons, in the production of which there were employed 690,438 men and boys. The production averaged 602 tons for each employee. The statistics regarding the accidents are obtained from reports of state mine inspectors, and there were no such offices for 1908 in the States of California, Georgia, Oregon, Texas, and Virginia. The statistics of accidents are therefore incomplete to that extent. The States from which accidents were reported produced 410,485,250 tons of coal in 1908. The total number of accidents reported for these States was 9,252, which were classified as 2,450 fatal and 6,802 nonfatal. The quantity of coal raised for each accident was 44,367 tons, and 167,545 tons raised for each life lost. The death rate was 3.6 per 1,000 employees.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The total coal production of Great Britain in 1908 was 292,912,250 short tons, in the production of which 972,232 persons were employed. These employees include men, women, girls, and boys. The production for each employee was 301 tons, which is just one-half that of the United States. The production includes 18,571 tons from quarries, or what we would call in this country open pits, for which the number of employees and accidents are not given.

The total number of accidents reported are 140,651, the nonfatal being those in which the disability exceeded seven days. There were 1,285 lives lost, so that the nonfatal accidents were 139,366. From this it would appear that there are many more accidents due to falls of slate, coal, and to other causes than explosions in Great Britain than in the United States. The quantity of coal produced in Great Britain for each life lost was 227,947 tons (about 60,000 tons more than in the United States), while the coal mined for each accident in Great Britain was 2,083 tons, as compared with 44,367 tons in the United States. Great Britain's death rate per 1,000 employees was 1.32.

GERMAN EMPIRE.

The German Empire produced in 1907 226,778,783 short tons, while the number of employees was 611,792. The quantity raised for each employee was therefore 371 tons. The nonfatal accidents in coal mines were not separately reported. The number of lives lost was 1,562, which shows that there were 145,185 tons of coal mined for each life lost. The death rate was 2.55 per 1,000 employees.

AUSTRIA.

Austria's coal production in 1907 was 44,216,042 short tons. The number of employees was 126,321, indicating an average of 350 tons for each employee. The total number of accidents reported was 1,829, of which 161 were fatal. The quantity of coal raised for each life lost was 274,633 tons, and for each accident 24,175 tons. The death rate for Austria was 1.27 per 1,000 employees. These statistics do not include the production or accidents in Hungary.

FRANCE.

The coal production in France in 1907 amounted to 40,513,934 short tons, and the mines gave employment to 183,862 persons, so that the quantity of coal mined for each employee was 220 tons. There were 34,177 accidents, of which 202 were fatal. The nonfatal accidents include those in which the employees were incapacitated for more than four days. The quantity of coal raised for each life lost was 200,564 tons, and for each accident 1,185 tons. The death rate per 1,000 employees was 1.10.

BELGIUM.

The death rate in Belgium is less than in any of the coal-producing countries for which statistics are available. This condition is due almost entirely to the excellent governmental supervision and the enforcement of discipline among the mine workers. The death rate in Belgium was 1.04 for each 1,000 employees. The country produced in 1907 coal amounting to 26,130,231 short tons, in the production of which 142,699 persons were employed. It is also to be noted that the quantity of coal mined for each employee is much less than in any of the other countries, the average for each in 1907 being 183 tons. The total number of accidents reported was 313, of which 148 were fatal, showing that the quantity of coal mined for each life lost was 176,556 tons, and for each accident 83,483 tons.

These statistics are summarized in the following table:

Country.	Year.	Production.	Number of employees.	Quantity raised per employee.
		Short tons.		Short tons.
United States.....	1908	415,842,638	630,438	602
Great Britain.....	1908	292,912,250	972,232	301
German Empire.....	1907	226,778,783	611,792	371
Austria.....	1907	44,216,042	126,321	350
France.....	1907	40,513,934	183,862	220
Belgium.....	1907	26,130,231	142,699	183

Country.	Number of accidents.	Quantity raised per accident.	Number of lives lost.	Quantity raised per life lost.	Death rate per 1,000 employees.
		Short tons.		Short tons.	
United States.....	9,252	44,367	2,450	167,545	3.60
Great Britain.....	140,651	2,083	1,288	227,947	1.32
German Empire.....			1,562	145,185	2.55
Austria.....	1,829	24,175	161	274,633	1.27
France.....	34,177	1,185	202	200,564	1.10
Belgium.....	313	83,483	148	176,556	1.04

Very respectfully,

GEO. OTIS SMITH, Director.

ALL DEAD IN MINE—LITTLE HOPE IS ENTERTAINED FOR IMPRISONED MEN—SEALED TO PREVENT FIRE—HELMETS AND OTHER PARAPHERNALIA RUSHED TO THE SCENE—FLAMES FROM SHAFT.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., April 21.

Little hope is expressed to-day that any of the 35 or 40 miners entombed in the Mulga mine of the Birmingham Coal and Iron Company as the result of an explosion about 9 o'clock last night would be rescued alive.

When the first crew of rescuers reached the bottom of the shaft this morning, the corpses of two miners were found. The rescuers upon returning to the surface expressed the opinion that all the imprisoned men were dead.

When it was learned that it was impossible to gain entrance to the mine through the shaft because the cages were sprung in the passage, the entrance was sealed to prevent, if possible, the spread of fire.

HELMETS FOR RESCUERS.

Shortly after midnight the hospital car of the Tennessee company was rushed to the scene equipped with helmets and all other necessary paraphernalia for entering a gaseous mine. Ambulances also were sent from Ensley and Birmingham to the scene, which is about 12 miles northwest of Birmingham.

The only list of names of the miners at work at the time of the explosion was held by the foreman of the gang at work, who is among the entombed men. It is believed, however, there are 15 white men and 20 or 25 negroes.

The mine has been in operation two years. The shaft is 350 feet deep, and the fact that flames shot from the mouth of the shaft to a height of 100 feet leads to the belief that the explosion occurred near the bottom of the main shaft.

GOVERNMENT AID SENT.

The United States Geological Survey has ordered its mine-rescue crew from the Knoxville (Tenn.) station to the Mulga mine.

Equipped with oxygen helmets, which enabled the rescuers to penetrate the shafts at the Cherry (Ill.) disaster hours before any human being unequipped with them could have lived, the government experts ought to be at the Mulga mine some time to-night.

EIGHTEEN MINERS IN OHIO KILLED—EXPLOSION BURIES COAL DIGGERS IN WORKINGS NEAR AMSTERDAM—RESCUE PARTIES RECOVER 26 BODIES FROM MULGA SHAFTS AT BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—"WINDY SHOT" CAUSED DISASTER.

STEUBENVILLE, OHIO, April 22.

Eighteen of a night force of 25 men employed in the mine of the Youghiogheny and Ohio Coal Company near Amsterdam are dead as a result of an explosion in the mine late last night. So far 6 bodies have been recovered. Seven were taken from the shaft alive, but in an unconscious condition. Rescue parties began work a few minutes after the explosion.

About 200 men are employed in the mine during the daytime. They quit work between 3 and 4 o'clock each evening. The victims worked at night, preparing for the day shift. It is thought that the explosion was caused by coal gas.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., April 22.

The work of removing the bodies of the 43 victims of the Mulga mine explosion was pushed with vigor to-day. Twenty-six bodies have been recovered.

Inspector Hillhouse declared to-day that never in the history of mining in Alabama has such damage been wrought by an explosion in a mine. He declared the accident was due to a "windy shot."

Mine experts equipped with the oxygen rescue apparatus started from the United States Geological Survey's mine rescue station at Pittsburg for New Amsterdam at noon yesterday.

Just after the explosion occurred the Ohio state mine inspector appealed over the long-distance telephone to the survey's headquarters in Washington, and the rescuers from Pittsburg were ordered out at once.

[From the Washington Times, Sunday, April 24, 1910.]

MINE DISASTERS MEET BUT LITTLE CHECK.

Recent dispatches tell of two appalling mine disasters, with great loss of life in each instance. Eighteen of a night force of 25 men, employed in a coal mine near Amsterdam, Ohio, are dead, owing to an explosion which was probably due to coal gas. This disaster comes right on the heels of a terrible one at the Mulga mine, near Birmingham, Ala. Forty-three lives were lost through an explosion in this mine, and it is said that never in the history of mining in Alabama has such damage been wrought by an explosion.

Such disasters, with their heavy death list, are the more appalling and discouraging when it is considered that in recent years the Federal Government and many of the States have been pursuing investigations for the purpose of reducing the loss of life in mines to the minimum, and when it is considered, further, how far European countries have carried their investigations in this direction.

It is impossible to study the statistics of the dead and injured in the mines of the country without coming to the conclusion that there is the utmost need for the proposed bureau of mines which Congress has been considering this winter. Such a bureau is needed in the first place to explore to the limit the causes of mine explosions and other accidents. With the fullest possible light shed on the question, so far as causes are concerned, it will be possible for state authorities to compel owners of mines to surround their properties with every safeguard and to induce miners to take needed precautions.

Presumably, the Federal Government has not the power to regulate the business of mining. But it can perform a great service by investigation. It is true valuable inquiries have already been made by the Geological Survey, but there is still wide room for further research work.

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIVE DEAD IN MINE—NONE BELIEVED TO HAVE SURVIVED AWFUL EXPLOSION—ELEVEN BODIES ARE FOUND—GAS IMPEDES THE RESCUE WORK IN SHAFT AT PALOS, ALA.—FLAMES LEAP TO HEIGHT OF 200 FEET AND SHOCK IS FELT FOR MILES—MAIL CARRIER, PASSING MOUTH OF DIGGINGS, IS BURNED TO A CRISP—GOVERNMENT EXPERTS ON SCENE WITH APPARATUS—PITIFUL SIGHTS AS PEOPLE GATHER AROUND THE PIT.

PALOS, ALA., May 5.

Caught in a terrific explosion this afternoon in Mine No. 3 of the Palos Coal and Coke Company, 45 white miners and 100 negroes are entombed. All hope that any of them may be rescued alive has been abandoned. It is thought if any of the men escaped death from the explosion they were suffocated by black damp.

Immediately after the explosion villagers organized to attempt to rescue those entombed. John Pasco and another miner went into the mine, but were shortly overcome by black damp and dragged out unconscious. Later a rescue party, under the direction of Assistant State Fire Inspector Neal, was equipped with oxygen helmets and sent into the mine. The party succeeded in going several hundred feet, where they found three bodies and a dead mule. No attempt was made to bring the bodies out on account of the fire damp, which soon drove the rescuers out.

At midnight rescue parties reached the 1,400-foot level and had found eight more bodies. A majority of the miners were working in the 2,300-foot level.

FLAMES LEAP HIGH IN AIR.

The flames from the explosion shot 200 feet into the air, and the shock was felt for miles. Timbers were hurled several hundred feet from the mouth of the mine. Rocks from the roof caved in and made access difficult. The fan machinery was damaged, but air is pumped into the mine to-night in hopes that some of the men are still alive.

Residents of Palos, which is 40 miles west of Birmingham, began at once to do what they could, but relief work was not started in earnest until a special train from Birmingham reached Palos late to-day. This special train carried State Mine Inspector James Hillhouse, J. J. Rutledge, government expert in charge of the geological station at Knoxville, Tenn., who was in the district investigating the recent disaster at Mulga; eight physicians and surgeons, four undertakers, and a number of special helpers.

The hospital relief car of the Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company was also taken. This car contained helmets and all other necessary paraphernalia for entering gas-filled mines.

The Palos mines have been worked for a number of years, and the entries were extensive. To-day's disaster, coming so soon after the Mulga explosion of April 21, when 41 men lost their lives, has plunged the mining settlements in grief.

When Members of Congress heard of the Palos disaster their thoughts turned at once to the measure now in conference for the creation of a

bureau of mines in the Interior Department. One of the chief purposes of the passage of such a bill was to provide for a thorough study of the causes of mine explosions, with a view to preventing them as far as possible through federal regulation.

Senator SCOTT, who had charge of the bill in the Senate, immediately took steps to get the conferees together for the adjustment of the differences between the Senate and the House. The bill will become a law as soon as the conference report is adopted and the act is signed by the President.

[From the Colliery Guardian of February 7, 1908.]

REPORT ON A MINE FIRE IN THE WHARNCLIFFE SILKSTONE COLLIERY, YORKSHIRE.

MIDLAND INSTITUTE OF MINING, CIVIL AND MECHANICAL ENGINEERS.

An ordinary meeting of this institute was held on Tuesday at the Philosophical Hall, Leeds. Mr. Walker, president, was in the chair.

RESCUE APPARATUS.

Two papers were read on the subject of a recent underground fire at the Wharncliffe Silkstone Colliery, Yorkshire, at which breathing apparatus were used, one by Mr. Jonathan Wroe, manager of the colliery, and the other by Mr. A. T. Winborn, who has charge of the joint rescue station which has been established at Tankersley for the use of the Wharncliffe Silkstone, Rockingham, Tankersley, Barrow, Thorncliffe, Smithy, Wood, and Grange collieries, all of which are situated within easy radius. The fire occurred at an electric haulage plant about a mile from the shaft, and it was pointed out that the fact of the fire having been extinguished without serious consequences did not render the incident less interesting as an object lesson.

In the course of his paper Mr. Wroe, after detailing the incidents of the fire, said that upon arrival of the breathing apparatus from the rescue station it was immediately put on by two officials under the supervision of Mr. Winborn, who at once attacked the flames, being able to approach close to the outbreak, applying effectively sand and water and fire extinguishers. They then succeeded in breaking open the concrete floor and the motor house and gradually subdued the heat beneath the floor. The task would have been quite impossible in the absence of any rescue apparatus.

The helmet type of the Draeger was used and proved a complete success. Had it been more readily to hand, the fire would have been extinguished much more quickly than was the case. No delay occurred at the rescue station, and Mr. Winborn was congratulated upon responding so promptly to the first real and serious call upon the rescuers of the rescue station. The apparatus was worn by three men for about one and three-fourth hours, and they experienced no special discomfort, save a few slight burns upon the hands through having to crawl, and no ill after-effects were felt as a direct result of their wearing the apparatus.

Mr. Wroe expressed the opinion that a couple of sets of rescue apparatus should be left at the colliery for emergency use, and that portable hand electric lamps should be added to the equipment. He also suggested that all underground officials should agree to undergo a course of training in the use of breathing apparatus.

Mr. Winborn, in the course of his observations upon the same incident, said the men called upon to wear the apparatus did not exhibit the least hesitation and had absolute confidence in it—a confidence which was confirmed by their experience in the foul air and intense heat. The apparatus was not found cumbersome, and the men were able to do effective work under actual conditions. There was about 4 feet of height in the place where they had to go, and they complained of no difficulty in breathing, even when excited by the presence of danger.

Discussing upon the relative merits of the helmet and the mouth-breathing type of apparatus, Mr. Winborn said the choice was governed entirely by circumstances, but in a case demanding sheer hard work and energy, the helmet type should be chosen, because the helmet afforded protection to the face and the head from flames and heat, and because it permitted the maximum amount of exertion by reason of the wearer having advantage of natural respiration. It was for these reasons that the Draeger helmet was used at the fire in question; but he went on to describe a more recent occasion where both the mouth-breathing and the helmet apparatus were severely tested in an accumulation of black damp. Owing to the rising of water in a dip working and the consequent interference with the ventilation a pump had become inaccessible, the light of the safety lamps being extinguished at a point of about 180 feet from the pump. The pump was partly submerged, and the workers were unable to accomplish their purpose, although they were able to make a thorough examination of the actual condition. They remained, for about three-quarters of an hour, and ultimately retired upon realizing their inability to do anything under the prevailing conditions, but not through any fault of the apparatus. Had the incident consisted solely of the getting out of a number of men under the influence of the gas, the task could have been accomplished with comparative ease. No discomfort was felt, and the wearers expressed themselves confident of wearing the apparatus for consecutive periods of two hours. This incident instilled in the men concerned a wonderful confidence in the apparatus, and Mr. Winborn described it as the severest and most practical test to which apparatus of modern type had been put in actual underground work in this country.

REQUIREMENTS OF A BREATHING APPARATUS OF PRACTICAL VALUE.

Engineering and mining papers, under the influence of the recent and most horrible mine disasters, have taken up the question of making use of breathing apparatus in mine disasters, in order to enable rescue men to take the injured out of the mines, as well as the bodies of those killed, while the mine is still filled with poisonous gases and after damp, nearly always produced by the explosion of gases or so-called coal dust.

Records in possession of the Draegerwerk, Lübeck, Germany, the manufacturers of the famous Draeger apparatus, show that chances remain to resuscitate a person suffocated in smoke and after damp by means of pure oxygen, even after being in those irrespirable gases for more than two hours.

The oxygen reviving trunk, manufactured by the Draegerwerk, Lübeck, Germany, is kept in a great number of rescue stations throughout Germany. It consists of a cylinder containing oxygen under a very high pressure connected with an automatic inhalator and provided with a sufficient supply of pure oxygen for one half hour's working. The apparatus is again ready for use by simply putting in a newly filled cylinder, as a result of which work upon a suffocated person can be continued for hours.

The writer's own personal experience has proven that persons, even after having been in after damp for a considerable length of time, will

resuscitate after ten minutes working upon them with pure oxygen, and in addition, the official report of the German Government mining officials investigating the Reden disaster, which occurred January 28, 1907, and in which out of 110 men who were underground at the time of the explosion over 40 men were saved by the employment of the Draeger rescue apparatus, states that about the same time was required to resuscitate the suffocated.

The use of the breathing or rescue apparatus is not only confined to rescue work in disasters, but a breathing that enables its wearer to do hard work is a prominent factor in fighting the most feared enemy of mines—a mine fire. On account of that, the amount of capital invested in an equipment of such apparatus will pay high interest to the purchaser when once employed in extinguishing an underground fire, which is easily done, as the apparatus which is ready for immediate use will enable the miners to get at the fire on the very start.

The following will give some data about the necessary requirements a rescue apparatus of practical value has to fulfill.

The idea of constructing rescue apparatus on the principle of furnishing its wearer with air out of a tank containing this gas under high pressure was given up by inventors about twenty years ago. The fact that nearly 50 liters of pure air per minute is the necessary amount of air the apparatus must supply continuously during a time of not less than two hours, bringing the total amount of air furnished during this time up to 6,000 liters, or 210 cubic feet, makes the idea impracticable. A cylinder containing this amount of 210 cubic feet of air, under 2,000 pounds pressure, would weigh not less than 180 pounds.

Recently apparatus have been constructed making use of liquid air. Besides the fact that no experience has been made about the regularity with which the air is discharged by the evaporizing liquid air, and further, about its chemical composition, that its chief objection will always be the difficulty of obtaining liquid air in larger quantities without a great expense.

The system of furnishing the wearer of a breathing apparatus with air, that has given the best results, and has found employment in all those apparatus that have devices in practical use, is the system of regenerating the air contained in the human lungs and the apparatus at the beginning of the work. By means of chemicals such as caustic potash and caustic soda the carbonic acid, CO₂, produced by the human lungs is taken out and the oxygen used up replaced out of a tank containing this gas under high pressure. The pressure of oxygen (1,875 pounds pressure are contained in the two cylinders at the beginning of the work), which is automatically reduced, always to be 75 pounds, does the work of keeping the air inside the apparatus in a constant circulation, by doing so forcing it to pass through the chemicals provided for the absorption of the CO₂.

To be able to construct an apparatus which will fulfill the aforesaid requirements:

- I. Of furnishing the wearer with a sufficient supply of air;
- II. To replace the amount of oxygen used up by the human lungs during the time of two hours; and
- III. To thoroughly absorb the carbonic acid, CO₂, produced by the human lungs during the time of two hours.

A number of very interesting tests have been made by Mr. Bernhard Draeger, the inventor of the famous "Draeger" life-saving apparatus, of which 2,000 apparatus are now in use all over the world.

About the amount of air a person requires during hard work few facts were known up to a very recent time. Generally this amount was supposed not to exceed 16 to 20 liters per minute.

Experiments made with different individuals have given the following average figures.

The exhaled air is measured by so-called spirometers (gasometer):

Requirements for one minute.

	Liters.
A person sitting down.....	8½
A person after a walk of 1,000 feet.....	11½
A person after marching over 2,000 feet.....	16
A person lifting heavy weights.....	35
Two persons carrying, in a stooping position, a human body.....	30
A person racing over a distance of 900 feet.....	55

On basis of these figures a rescue apparatus that will enable its wearer to do any kind of hard work must furnish an amount of air of not less than 50 liters per minute during the entire working time of two hours.

This done by the Draeger apparatus.

During heavy work, and particularly after heavy work, there are always a few seconds or periods during which the amount of air required is momentarily increased to even more than 100 liters per minute. A life-saving apparatus can only afford an absolute safety if it assists the workman unconsciously and without becoming oppressive even during the heaviest breathing. This requirement is met in the construction of the heaviest "Draeger" apparatus.

We will now proceed to investigate the amount of oxygen that must be supplied by the rescue apparatus.

The amount of oxygen used up by the human lungs during rest is ascertained to be about 0.3 liter, this amount gradually increasing to 1.75 liters during the very hardest work, such as requiring up to 55 liters of circulation air during a minute. An apparatus that will afford to do any kind of hard work has, on account of that, to supply not less than 2 liters of pure oxygen per minute.

In contradiction with other articles, the writer wishes to state that it is useless to increase this amount of oxygen supplied in the hope of by doing so to overcome the harmful effects of carbonic acid in the breathing air. Sorry to say that oxygen does not have these qualities, and its effect upon the well-being of the body commences only when the air is free of carbonic acid CO₂.

The historic development of the life-saving apparatus, since the first apparatus have been constructed some twenty years ago, show a constant battle with the carbonic acid which could not be done away with.

Only an apparatus that will furnish the wearer with a circulation air always free of this gas will be an ideal one.

Careful experiments have shown that—

The carbonic acid contained in pure air amounts to 1/2 9/00.

The carbonic acid contained in bad room air amounts to 2 9/00.

The carbonic acid contained in unhealthy air amounts to 10 9/00.

The carbonic acid contained in the air is dangerous when being over 20/25 9/00.

The carbonic acid contained in the air is very poisonous when being over 39 9/00.

The carbonic acid contained in the air is deadly at 40 9/00.

A rescue apparatus, on a basis of these figures, should never allow the amount of carbonic acid contained in the circulation air to rise above 100/00.

Very interesting experiments have been made by Mr. Bernhard Draeger to ascertain:

I. The amount of carbonic acid contained in the respiration air of different apparatus;

II. How this amount of carbonic acid affected the wearer of the respective apparatus; and

III. How far, on account of the carbonic acid being in the circulation air, the working power of the wearer was reduced.

A number of tests, made under the supervision of a chartered law chemist, have shown that, meanwhile, a workman using a Draeger apparatus in which, during the two hours of working time, the amount of carbonic acid did not rise over 2-0/00, on an average, was able to do work equal to moving 35 tons 1 meter; a workman using an apparatus of different make, but of the same construction, and in which the carbonic acid rose up to 20-0/00, on an average, was obliged to be taken out of the smoke chamber twice in a faint. The work done hardly came up to 20 tons. Work is registered by a working machine, the workmen lifting a weight of 25 kilos, always 1 meter.

The experiments have further shown that the working power of a workman is reduced 9 per cent by wearing a Draeger apparatus.

The above lines show that, beside a sufficient circulation of air and a sufficient supply of oxygen, the most important factor in the construction of a rescue apparatus is the thorough absorption of the carbonic acid produced by the human lungs. In fact, years of experience in working with rescue apparatus in mine fires and explosions have convinced the writer that an apparatus will be of practical value only when its construction fulfills perfectly this requirement.

The weight of all different breathing apparatus is about 30 pounds each, the difference between the different makes amounting to hardly more than 1 or 2 pounds, which, of course, is of little consequence.

Of the lighter apparatus which are on the market, none have met with success on account of either the supply of oxygen or the absorption of the carbonic acid not being sufficient. As long as science will not enable inventors to stock compressed gases in cylinders of less weight, or furnish chemicals, such as peroxide of sodium, without the bad qualities of producing such an enormous heat as to set the whole apparatus on fire—as has been the case with a pneumotogen apparatus used last year by a German mine assessor—a decrease in the weight of such an apparatus can not be obtained.

An important fact in the construction of rescue apparatus which should always be considered is the means it provides for recharging the apparatus.

The writer considers the so-called potash cartridges of the Draeger apparatus, which come packed and sealed, as the very best idea for doing this work in the shortest time possible, and at the same time making it impossible to make any mistake in the amount of chemicals that are to be put in.

Of the helmet or mouth-bag construction, the different apparatus have adopted the helmet outfit of the Draeger apparatus, which seems to me to be the most perfect one, as it enables the wearer of the apparatus to breathe as accustomed and at the same time to hear, see, and talk, which enables him to communicate with his fellow-workmen. Personal experience has shown me the importance of this fact.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] ten minutes.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, there is now on the calendar a bill known as the civil war volunteer officers' retired bill, to authorize the placing on the pension list with retired pay certain officers who served in the army and navy in the war of 1861-1865, and for other purposes. The other purposes are to provide a pension of \$30 a month to certain enlisted men who come within the provisions of the act.

It has always been the policy of the Government to retire its civil volunteer officers on pay. In 1828 and 1832 Congress passed retirement acts for the benefit of the surviving civil volunteer officers of the Revolution. Acts of like character have been passed from time to time for the benefits of civil volunteer officers of other wars, in which the United States have been engaged. This has been done on the theory that the civil volunteer officers, in a war of any magnitude, became as efficient to mobilize, direct, and conduct great campaigns, and with as much judgment, care, precision, and skill as the officers of the Regular Army, who are retired at the age of 64 on three-fourths pay.

The fifth section of this bill is a compromise offered by the Military Committee for the almost universal demand of the soldiers of the late war for what is known as the dollar-a-day pension bill. Whether from long-continued agitation, or because of a widespread necessity of the surviving soldiers, now numbering 500,000 strong, that the so-called dollar-a-day bill has become their slogan, it is difficult to tell. The only question now considered by them is, At what age should the benefits accrue, and how much service should the soldier have rendered? These two items, however, are mere matters of detail.

There are several reasons why the dollar-a-day bill is insisted on:

First. The soldier was paid, except the first few payments in 1861, in a greatly depreciated currency. Their enlistment was made at a wage supposed to be on a gold basis of payment, and therefore the Government has never, in good faith, fully discharged its obligation.

Second. The service was a long and severe one, and the privations endured because the Government was not sufficiently equipped with clothing, food, and tents, were much greater than anyone had reason to expect when the war opened.

Third. Diseases were unavoidably contracted that prevented the great soldier body from entering those fields of commercial

activities after the war that were remunerative and by which they could have provided against misfortunes and diseases incident to advanced age.

Fourth. The stupendous results accruing to the Republic through their services and sacrifices entitle them to generosity at the hands of a rich and prosperous Government that they were the instruments in saving.

No soldier of any age or country ever displayed more valor and heroism, more patriotism and bravery, more devotion and sacrifice than did the volunteer soldier of 1861-1865. The effective soldier in all history has always been the volunteer soldier, not the pampered product of the military school. The volunteer soldier fresh from the farm, shop, and every activity of life, quick to understand military tactics, willing to be taught, ready to obey commands, resolute to accomplish results, always marches to certain victory.

And if I may be permitted, no State in all this federation of States has a brighter historic page than that of Indiana. When the thunder cloud of war blackened her sunny skies, as calls came, one after another, from the great President of the Republic for men, her sons from cottage, farm, and shop turned their faces toward the southland till 160,000 of them had joined hands with those from other Commonwealths to maintain this Union of States. From the northern to the southern, from her eastern to her western boundary, one man out of every three cast his life and his fortune into that conflict that has no equal in all the annals of time.

I desire to incorporate the fifth section of the bill to which I have referred in my remarks:

SEC. 5. That any person who served as an enlisted man ninety days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the civil war, and who has been honorably discharged therefrom, and whose physical or mental condition is of such degree of disability as to require the frequent and periodical aid and attention of another person, shall, upon application, have his name placed on the volunteer retired list created by this act, and shall receive, in lieu of all pensions, retired pay at the rate of \$30 per month during the period of his natural life.

This section does not appeal to me, because its provisions are so restrictive that but a limited number can be benefited, and because very many soldiers will be denied the privilege of participating who are equally deserving but can not come within its limitations. I do not believe a soldier should be so disabled, either physically or mentally, that he requires the "frequent and periodical attention and aid of another person" before he may ask for the benefits purporting to accrue to this section. Men in fair health, at an advanced age, necessarily, so long after the war, so much so as not to need the "periodical aid and assistance of another person," may yet be very poor, with persons lawfully dependent upon them for support, that a liberal pension ought to be granted them. A pension ought not to be handed out as a gratuity or as an offering for charity, but as a part of a remuneration for faithful services rendered in time of great national stress. The Government ought not to wait till the soldier, once wholly engrossed in its preservation, reaches such a degree of physical or mental decrepitude that he can no longer care for himself before it gives to him that which in good conscience belongs to him.

If there is one characteristic above another that the soldier justly prides himself in, it is that he is not an object of national charity; that his self-respect gives him that independence that resents the imputation that he is a ward of the Government. I like the attitude of a grateful Government that assumes, in placing laws for the relief of the soldier on the statute books, that it does not do so under a force that smacks of charity or benevolence, but with a discharge of a lawful obligation it contracted with every Union soldier in the war of 1861-1865.

The chief objection urged against the enactment of \$1 a day pension bill is that it would so increase the expenses of the Government as to be a burden. Undoubtedly the appropriations for pensions would be greater, but who has a better right to increased appropriations than the soldier who made the appropriations possible? I am tired of this objection and of the deception practiced upon the soldier. A large number of the members of this Chamber in their respective canvasses expressed themselves in hearty sympathy with the dollar-a-day movement. Many state conventions of both parties have incorporated planks in their platforms indorsing it. It is time to redeem the promise. The matter of cost can not be successfully made an objection.

We spend between fifty and sixty millions this year in our rivers and harbors bill. Large sums upon schemes and propositions of very questionable value from a commercial standpoint; indeed upon some of which an adverse report has been filed by the government engineers. Money spent with a prodigal hand under no concrete plan, without any established system of internal improvement. There is money for "pork barrels" but not for general increase of pension legislation, because it would

be extravagant, and because you have "already received liberal treatment." You have legislated for "favorite systems" and "great corporate interests" until they have such a strangle hold upon the Government that the entire executive force, so said, is devoted with nervous anxiety to relieve the country from their clutches, but legislation for the soldier must be postponed because economy must be entrenched in our expenditures.

It has been said that we expend three hundred millions a year more than we ought to spend if the Government was run on a business basis. I do not know whether this is true or not. One of the most distinguished citizens of the country—thirty years in the United States Senate—says so. A criminal waste of more than \$3 for every man, woman, and child in the United States every year, an absolute loss in government graft and favoritism, and no effort to return to a safe, sane, and economic business method in government. Granting that it is true, do you know that if this wicked extravagance was conserved for two years it would increase the pension of every living soldier at 70 years of age to \$1 a day for his lifetime?

It has been said that the United States has been liberal with its soldiers, more so than any other Government. That depends upon what, under all the circumstances, you call liberality.

On June 30, 1909, there were on the rolls 104,581 soldiers drawing \$12 a month under the act of June 27, 1890. This is 40 cents a day to feed, clothe, pay incidental expenses, and in many cases house rent for the soldier and his wife. You will remember too that living has increased 55 per cent in the last ten years, so that the 40 cents a day he now receives will only purchase but little more than what 20 cents a day would when his pension was first allowed. But suppose this soldier was fortunate enough to be old enough to get the benefits of the law of February 6, 1907, of whom there were on the 30th day of June, 1909, 358,315, drawing \$15 or \$20 a month—50 cents or 66 cents a day, according to age. Applying the same rule with the added infirmity that comes from advanced age necessarily, his condition is not materially improved. We are told that wages have also increased with the increase cost of living. So they have, 22 per cent, but what does that matter to the soldier who is disabled and unable to work? For the benefit of those who may be glad to know the number of pensioners on June 30, 1909, and on June 30, 1908, and the several classes they are divided into, I include a statement taken from the report of the Commissioner of Pensions.

Pensioners on the roll June 30, 1909, and June 30, 1908.

	1909.	1908.	Gain.	Loss.
Revolutionary war:				
Daughters	1	2		1
War of 1812:				
Widows	395	471		76
Indian wars:				
Survivors	1,744	1,830		76
Widows	2,881	3,018		137
War with Mexico:				
Survivors	2,459	2,932		473
Widows	6,633	6,914		281
Civil war:				
Act of February 6, 1907	358,315	338,341	19,974	
General law—				
Invalids	131,065	142,044		10,979
Widows	73,356	75,515		2,159
Minor children	498	541		43
Mothers	2,996	3,688		692
Fathers	493	656		163
Brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters	280	240	40	
Helpless children	514	528		14
Act of June 27, 1890—				
Invalids	104,581	140,600		36,019
Minor children	4,010	3,954	56	
Helpless children	323	295	28	
Act of April 19, 1908—				
Widows	211,781	188,445	23,336	
Army nurses	478	510		32
War with Spain:				
Invalids	21,937	20,548	1,419	
Widows	1,159	1,145	14	
Minor children	333	331	2	
Mothers	3,097	2,096	1	
Fathers	529	536		7
Brothers and sisters	8	7	1	
Helpless children	2	2		
Regular establishment:				
Invalids	12,423	11,786	640	
Widows	2,648	2,580	68	
Minor children	129	120	9	
Mothers	923	871	52	
Fathers	154	139	15	
Brothers and sisters	7	5	2	
Helpless children	9	7	2	
Total	946,194	951,687	45,659	51,152
Net loss				5,493

I want to call attention to the value of each respective class of pensions for the last five years, as shown in the following table, taken from the last report of the Commissioner of Pensions:

Average value of each pension for the last five years.

	1909.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.
Average annual value of each pension	\$169.82	\$167.59	\$145.60	\$138.18	\$135.96
Regular establishment	181.77	173.76	173.12	173.35	174.19
General law, civil war	219.96	215.30	204.20	191.43	187.51
Act of June 27, 1890	135.55	130.75	112.32	114.33	113.20
War with Spain	126.83	126.87	127.19	127.33	127.90
Act of February 6, 1907	169.40	167.70	170.09		
Act of April 19, 1908	145.42	145.10			

The very highest rate is that for the general law, civil war, \$219.96, and this is an increase over the year 1908 by \$4.66. This increase arises from the fact that so many soldiers are rapidly approaching the highest rate under the February 6, 1907, law.

We are not to be concluded with the statement that we have been liberal. That contention is answered completely by the course of Congress in its liberal pension legislation as to numbers. There are now before this Congress approximately 25,000 claims of soldiers for special legislation. So insistent has the demand for relief by special legislation grown in late years that the Committee on Pensions has been compelled to establish rules for the consideration of claims. The action was not only wise, but necessary on the part of the committee, because of the volume of claims. This demand for legislative relief has been invited by the policy of Congress, so that it now finds itself embarrassed by the situation. Originally it was the policy of Congress to dispose of only those cases that were exceptionally meritorious, and could not be reached by the existing pension laws. This latitude for the consideration has been widened gradually, till Congress is burdened by this class of legislation. Out of the multitude, Congress, through its committee, can consider but a limited number. It must, of right, consider those possessing the most merit as determined by its rules. It therefore established the following rule:

No relief will be given soldiers except they are in such a physical condition as to be wholly or partially helpless, and are destitute.

The committee also adopted the following rule, known as Rule 5, among others, to govern the consideration of claims, which is as follows:

RULE 5. Bills for increasing pensions to officers or enlisted men will not be given consideration unless total incapacity for the performance of manual labor is established by the evidence on file in the Pension Bureau or filed with the bill. The soldier must establish his title to and be granted the highest rate of pension under the law applicable to his case before applying to Congress. If it be shown that a soldier who is in receipt of not less than \$12 per month is in absolutely destitute circumstances and is suffering from a permanent disability of an extreme nature rendering him wholly or partly helpless, a bill proposing to grant additional pension may be favorably considered. The amount of pension allowed will be governed by conditions of service in connection with extreme disability and destitution. If a rejected claim under other laws exists the equities in such claim will receive consideration in connection with the bill.

But even under this rule the committee can not try all the meritorious cases, as established by this test. Hundreds and thousands are turned away because of the inability of the committee to consider them. Those claims that are considered and allowed are at the rate of \$24 to \$30 a month; very few higher. This is an admission that the Government is not extremely liberal, else these claimants would be turned away and required to abide by the law.

The objection to the system of disposing of claims by special legislation is that there must necessarily be discrimination between worthy claimants. If two men are alike diseased, alike enfeebled, alike destitute, and one of them is to be benefited by special act, why not the other? If but 3,000 or 4,000 special acts are passed this session, and that will be about the number passed, why not the remaining 20,000 if they fall within the rule? It is not an injustice to provide for the 3,000 or 4,000, but it is an injustice to turn away those equally entitled to the benefits of congressional legislation.

Death is decimating the ranks of the soldier every year. Last year 48,312 answered the last roll call. Such shocking mortality among the heroes of that terrific struggle appalls us. But a few more annual gatherings, and a mere remnant will be left of the victorious hosts that with their blood cemented forever this union of States.

Why not transfer to Washington the business of the 18 pension agencies in the several States, for the maintenance of which last year we appropriated \$500,000? Every man who has examined the subject knows that they are maintained as a mere political asset for the Congressman in the district or for the Sen-

ator of the prevailing party in the State where located. Why not save for the soldier the \$500,000 we appropriated for the various examining boards scattered through the country, another piece of political gearing for the party in power? Why not save the \$380,000 we appropriated last year for special examiners—gentlemen who travel over the country to see how not to increase a soldier's pension and who not infrequently slip into a community and pick up evidence against a soldier, without giving him an opportunity to appear and cross-examine the witness or know what he has testified to, and on this testimony files with the Government his recommendation as to what the evidence proves and what the finding should be?

Why not wipe out all technicalities and let this mighty Republic, with resources so vast, with wealth so great, and the future so beneficent as to crown the glory of all the ages past, enact a general pension law that will bring peace and happiness and comfort to the fireside of every soldier? Let us teach the world and the nations that may come after us, if war there must needs be to save the rights and liberties of the race, that we can not only be just to our victorious soldiers, but that we want to be magnanimous and grateful.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON]. [Applause.]

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, the applause with which the House welcomes my first speech on the floor is not only complimentary but encouraging for a man like me, who, aside from not being an orator, must make a speech in a language not his own. I thank you, gentlemen of the House, for your courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, far off, in the Pacific Ocean, there is a group of over 3,000 islands, with a total area of 115,026 square miles, known as the Philippine Archipelago, and poetically named the "Pearl of the Orient." Over 8,000,000 civilized people—Christians—are the inhabitants thereof, who have for twelve years been committed to your care, it is said, by Divine Providence, as a sacred trust.

LIBERALITY OF THE NEW SOVEREIGN.

To those distant islands, Mr. Chairman, I beg to direct the attention of the House; and in so doing, I am glad to be able to affirm, first of all, that simultaneously with the American occupation there has been established a more liberal government, and from that day the Filipinos have enjoyed more personal and political liberty than they ever did under the Spanish Crown. [Applause.] These facts are freely acknowledged throughout the length and breadth of the islands, and my countrymen wish me most cordially to assure the House and, through it, the people of the United States, that they are grateful, profoundly grateful, for all the benefits that your Government has conferred upon them.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Having said thus much, I shall proceed straight to my point. We all know, Mr. Chairman, that the paramount duty imposed by President McKinley upon the Philippine Commission, which was to represent the Federal Government and carry out its policy in the archipelago, was to secure the happiness and prosperity of the Filipino people. In pursuance of this duty, the first Philippine Commission, presided over by the present "First Man of the Land," devoted itself to the organization of civil government and to making material improvements in the islands.

It is but just to say that the commission, by its doings and accomplishments, has contributed its share to the common cause of human progress and civilization. Honor and glory to its members and to their country!

The names of these commissioners, more particularly those of Taft and Smith, are permanently graven in the minds and hearts of the Filipinos by the chisel of gratitude.

They have established provincial and municipal governments, almost completely autonomous, supervised only by a very efficient executive bureau, at the head of which is a very able and hard-working man, Mr. Carpenter.

They have created a body of constabulary, whose duty is to cooperate with the municipal and provincial officials in the maintenance of public order. The chiefs of this body—General Bandholtz, Colonel Harbord, and the others—are very brilliant men, carefully selected from the officers of the Regular Army. By their tact and their love for the islanders they have converted the organization, once really unpopular, into one of the most useful and praised of the official organizations.

They have built up a system of education which offers equal opportunities for learning to the poor and to the rich.

They have given us a supreme court worthy to be compared to any other tribunal in the world. The chief justice, Hon. Cayetano Arellano, is a man of wide learning and with a reputation in his profession extending far beyond the confines of the islands.

They have secured for us an assembly which, although it has very limited power, answers, at least, to the purpose of expressing the will of the people and showing its governing capacity. Osmeña and his colleagues of the first and second assembly have made living proof of my countrymen's fitness for self-government.

They have beautified the city of Manila, the capital of the archipelago, improved its sanitary conditions, completed its harbor works, and provided it with a trolley system.

They have constructed all over the islands more than 500 miles of highways and roads, hundreds of steel and concrete bridges, and thousands of concrete culverts.

They have multiplied the number of light-houses and knitted the islands with lines of telegraphs and telephones.

They have provided a great number of towns with artesian wells, and built schoolhouses even in almost inaccessible parts of the archipelago.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that the Filipino people have paid for all these things from the revenues of the islands; but none the less, it is true that the insular government should have the main credit for it.

HINDRANCE OF PEOPLE'S HAPPINESS.

All this we acknowledge; for all this we are thankful; for all this we are grateful to your Government and to your people. But, sir, despite it all, the Filipinos are not, as yet, a happy people. Would you ask me why? Then, I will answer in the language of that great apostle of human freedom, Daniel Webster:

No matter how easy may be the yoke of a foreign power, no matter how lightly it sits upon the shoulders, if it is not imposed by the voice of his own nation and of his own country, he will not, he can not, and he means not to be happy under its burden.

These words to us, Mr. Chairman, are freedom's text and rallying cry. We feel their truth deep in our souls, for it is the vital spark of our national hope. This is not, however, the only reason why the Filipinos are not contented.

CHARACTER OF THE PHILIPPINE GOVERNMENT.

Consider the character of the Philippine government. The organic act which created that government is entitled—

An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

By the title of this act we understand that the government so established is intended to be a provisional government; that by this act nothing definite or final was done or intended to be done; that Congress reserved its judgment on all save the immediate needs of the then present. Considering that at the time of the passage of the act Congress had not had the opportunity to know the condition of affairs in the islands, this position was, probably, the wisest to take from your standpoint.

But, eight years have elapsed since the enactment of that law, and nearly twelve since the American occupation of the Philippines, and the "temporary" government still remains unchanged. There is no sign, so far as I can see, that Congress contemplates providing the islands with some sort of a permanent government. Thus, the shadow hangs over us, and we know not to what we must look forward. Indeed, in one way or another high officials of the administration have voiced what is said to be the policy of the United States regarding the Philippines; but we know that, at best, these utterances expressed the opinion of but one branch of this Government, and that not the lawmaking branch. The authoritative voice must come from Congress, for it alone can say what the policy of the United States shall be. Congress alone can end the suspense, but Congress remains noncommittal.

This undefined policy is the natural source of unrest throughout the archipelago, both on the part of the Filipinos and Americans, as well as of foreigners, and I do not hesitate to affirm that every single human being living in the islands, or who has any interest therein, anxiously wishes to see something definite done by Congress.

EXECUTIVE CONTROL.

This, Mr. Chairman, so far as concerns the character of the so-called "organic act." But, if we analyze its provisions, we find further explanation for the anxiety of the Filipino people. It has been said that the main reason, so far, for refusing the Filipinos their independence is that, with no previous experience in popular government, were they to be left alone, some form of oligarchical government would be established. Oligarchy, you say, is contrary to the theory of government of the American people.

Some sort of oligarchy—which I deny would be the government following Filipino independence—is precisely what holds sway in the Philippines. We do not have a representative government. The power is concentrated in a very small group of persons, namely, the governor-general and the members of the

Philippine Commission, who are appointed without the consent or advice of the Filipinos. Needless to point out that the assembly, the only elective body in the insular government, is powerless to carry out the will of its constituents, without the consent of the appointed upper house. The only difference between our present form of government and Philippine oligarchy is that now those few in control are Americans, whereas under a Philippine oligarchy those in authority would be Filipinos.

The separation between executive and legislative powers, which is the everlasting foundation of your political institutions, is entirely ignored in the "organic act." The upper house, and, in fact, the predominant one, is mainly composed of the governor-general and the four secretaries of departments.

Nor is the independence of the judiciary, save the supreme court, guaranteed in said act. The executive branch, namely, the Philippine Commission, was invested by the act with the power to organize the courts, and, in the exercise of this power, the commission enacted a law (No. 136), section 48 of which reads as follows:

There shall be in each province in which civil government has been or shall be organized under the sovereignty of the United States a court of first instance, in each of which a judge shall preside, to be appointed by the Philippine Commission—to hold office during its pleasure.

A literal construction of this section of the law gives the Philippine Commission the authority to remove any judge of the court of first instance at any time, and with or without reason, except the will of the commission.

And while, so far as I can say, there has not been a single case in which a judge has been removed arbitrarily, the mere fact that such power exists lays the judges open to at least the inferential imputation that they may be or are dependent upon the Executive. This is an injustice to the judiciary, and to the Executive as well, which could be easily avoided by making the term of office of these judges the same as that of the United States federal judges.

Moreover, as the assembly has no power of impeachment, there is no means by which abuse of power or malfeasance on the part of high officials of the government can be reached except through the ordinary procedure of the criminal courts.

The courts of first instance have sole original jurisdiction in grave criminal offenses, so that into these courts such cases must go. Now, it is claimed by learned lawyers that judges of these tribunals, being the appointees of those officials and *holding office at their pleasure*, are not competent to try any case in which said officials are involved. The contention is one of weight; and if it be right, there is no shield, save the character of the man himself, that interposes between the Filipino people and the rankest oppression and wrong. It is true that in such cases we can appeal to the President of the United States, but this procedure is not always expedient. Furthermore, taking it for granted that the courts of first instance have jurisdiction over cases in which the governor-general or any member of the commission is interested, either as a plaintiff or as a defendant, under the circumstances it can hardly remove the doubt of the public as to the independence of the court in said cases. So the law puts those high officials in an unfortunate position should they need the aid of the court in any criminal or civil suit, for they never could have complete satisfaction out of it.

I note, Mr. Chairman, and I wish the House to take notice of my statement, that I am not on this occasion making any complaint against any member of the executive branch of the Philippine government; and so far as concerns the governors-general, I will say, unhesitatingly, that they all have exercised their unlimited power fairly and justly. From the first governor-general, now President of the United States, known everywhere as the "friend of the Filipinos," down to Governor Forbes, the present executive of the islands, a man of high character and righteousness, there is not one against whom anyone could raise his voice. In fact, nothing bespeaks so loudly the greatness of these men as their triumph over the mighty temptations of unrestricted authority. I complain not of men, but of the law and the flaws therein, which make room for the abuse of power and subjects the judiciary, the only safeguard of personal right and liberties, to criticism if not to the mercy of the executive.

POVERTY OF THE FILIPINOS.

I come now, Mr. Chairman, to the matter of the wealth of the islands, the question of prosperity. I regret to have to assert that the Filipinos are very far from being prosperous, for they are certainly very poor. For the two years of the war and the two years thereafter, the farms were entirely abandoned. When peace came and the people were again able to work the dread scourge of the rinderpest appeared.

Ninety per cent of all work animals lay down and died, thus rendering impossible the cultivation of the lands. Add to war

and the rinderpest, unlooked-for disasters, the locust, typhoons, and floods, which from time to time devastate the plantations. It is no wonder that the Filipinos are poor. The Filipino is a farmer. The wealth of the islands is in agriculture. There is no better gauge of the poverty of an agricultural people than the amount and character of their food imports. Rice, which is the main food of the Filipinos, was never imported prior to the war in excess of \$200,000 in one single year. Since the war our average annual import of rice is \$6,500,000, and for one year it rose to \$12,000,000. A scarcity of rice means starvation to many.

I hope that no one, from what I am saying, will consider that I mean to reflect upon the American Government. I am far from holding the insular government responsible for rinderpest, locusts, and all sorts of calamities which have fallen and are falling heavily upon the islands; nor do I insinuate that the governor is to be blamed for our poverty. But I do believe that the government could ameliorate the economic conditions of the archipelago.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURE A FAILURE.

Take, for instance, the depression in agriculture. This is due mainly, if not entirely, to the lack of work animals, which is the effect of the rinderpest. The government, instead of concentrating from the very beginning its efforts toward stamping out this disease, has done very little in connection with this, the most vital subject touching the welfare of the country. The bureau of agriculture, which ought to be the most important bureau after that of education, is in reality the least cared for. No successful effort has been made to get the best-fitted man at the head of the bureau, nor have sufficient appropriations been granted to carry on an efficient campaign against this destructive disease. Consequently the bureau has so far been a complete failure. Our work animals still die daily, and our lands remain uncultivated.

However, Governor Forbes, who certainly has at heart the prosperity of the Filipinos, in his inaugural speech has given assurances to my people that his administration will use all possible means to overcome this calamity. I sincerely hope that he may succeed, not only for the untold benefit which will be rendered to my country, but also for the renown of my respected friend, the governor.

EXPENSIVE GOVERNMENT.

Another point, and a very important one, too, wherein the Government may be justly criticised for not helping to lift the Filipino people from their present state of poverty, is in the matter of taxation. The economic condition confronting the American Government in the Philippines requires, in truth, a very simple form of government, so as to avoid laying any unnecessary burden of taxation upon the people. But, instead of this, we have imposed upon us an expensive government, out of all keeping with the real needs of the country, and out of keeping with the ability of the country to support it. There are bureaus, maintained at a large expense, engaged in purely scientific work, important perhaps in itself, but of no immediate benefit to the Filipinos. In addition, there are bureaus, that of public lands, for instance, that could be annexed to others without the slightest harm to the service. Officials in the Philippines are better paid than in this wonderfully rich country. For example, secretaries of departments in the Philippines get \$15,500 a year, while members of the President's Cabinet get only \$12,000.

The result of all this is that we are overtaxed.

REVENUES OF THE ISLANDS.

The revenues from all sources of the insular, provincial, and municipal governments for the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1909, amounted to over \$21,000,000. If we compare this amount with the \$20,168,991.02, which was the total money in circulation on that date, we find that the taxation is such as to require the payment to the government of the entire circulation once in each year. These figures speak for themselves.

PHILIPPINE TAXATION COMPARED WITH CUBAN AND PORTO RICAN.

However, it has been said that we are a lightly taxed people, because the per capita taxation in the islands is only about \$2.50. This might be true if no consideration be given to the wealth or, rather, the poverty of the Filipinos. Comparing the Philippines with the other countries which came into your hands after the Spanish war, we see that Cuba, with a population of about 2,000,000, has a foreign trade of almost \$200,000,000; Porto Rico, with a population of about 1,000,000, has \$57,000,000; while the Philippines, with a population of 8,000,000, has only \$59,000,000. That is to say, Cuba has \$100 trade per capita; Porto Rico, \$56; and the Philippines, \$7. So that the Cuban with his per capita tax of \$13.33 and his trade of \$100, and the Porto Rican with his per capita tax of \$3.70 and his trade

of \$56, compared with the Filipino, whose per capita tax is \$2.50 and whose trade is \$7, are scarcely taxed at all.

SECRETARY OF WAR FAVORS LOWER TAXATION.

As a matter of justice, I want to state that the Secretary of War, who is deeply interested in the welfare of my country, has not overlooked this question of taxation. Through the Bureau of Insular Affairs, run by a peculiarly qualified man, General Edwards, and his unsubstitutable assistant, Colonel McIntyre, the Secretary of War has at hand some plan for the reduction of taxes, at least while we are not relieved from our personal poverty.

THE HOPE OF THE FILIPINOS.

Mr. Chairman, from what I have said it can be seen that the affairs of the islands are not in a very encouraging state; rather, that the outlook is depressing. The Filipinos, however, are patiently and hopefully looking forward to brighter days. We are aware that you have not gone to those islands for your own profit; we are aware that you have not gone there to subjugate us, but to emancipate us. The lesson of your history—the most brilliant history of all the nations of the world—is inconsistent with any other motive in your dealings with the Filipinos than that of making them free. This great Republic, founded and reared by liberty-loving people, can not undertake any task not in keeping with right, justice, happiness, and liberty for all mankind. We have an unshaken faith in the future destiny of our beloved fatherland, since its fate was committed to your care. We firmly believe and sincerely trust that the day will soon come when this Congress, composed of the representatives of a God-fearing people, will generously give to us the blessings of that freedom which has made you so happy, so prosperous, and so great, and which is after all the keynote of the happiness and prosperity of every people. When that time comes, and let us hope that it may happen to-morrow, the day when was raised in the Philippines the ever-glorious Stars and Stripes will eternally be the best-celebrated day of our national life. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to ask the gentleman from the Philippine Islands a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from the Philippine Islands yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. QUEZON. I do.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I would like to ask the gentleman how his people will view the new movement of American capital into the Philippine Islands to buy up and develop large tracts of land there?

Mr. QUEZON. My people are informed of the policy of the United States Government upon this question, which is not to sell more than 1,024 hectares of land to any corporation, and they have from the very beginning applauded this policy. In fact, the Filipinos have considered the provision of the "organic act" limiting the area of land acquirable by corporations to 1,024 hectares as the best proof that the Philippines have not been occupied by Americans for exploitation purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. And they would not applaud any departure from that policy, then?

Mr. QUEZON. No, indeed.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. But supposing the land is held in large tracts in the names of agents of exploiting foreign corporations or interests?

Mr. QUEZON. The result would be the same; it would be just as objectionable.

Mr. Chairman, I shall avail myself of the opportunity afforded to me by the questions of the gentleman from Colorado to make clear the attitude of the Filipinos regarding the land question. We are not anticapitalists, neither are we antiforeigners. We do not want to encircle the islands with some sort of a Chinese wall; we welcome the coming in of capital to stimulate commerce and develop industry. We receive with open arms every foreigner who visits or lives with us. The hospitality of the Filipinos is proverbial. But we are against the ownership of large tracts of land, either by corporations or by individuals, for it is incompatible with the real prosperity of the natives. You can not have, Mr. Chairman, a solid, conservative, contented, law-abiding community unless the plain people, as your beloved Lincoln affectionately called them, have and cultivate their own land. Moreover, large agricultural enterprises in the Philippines will, sooner or later, bring about Chinese or other oriental immigration into the islands, which we are fighting against. For these reasons I, on behalf of my people as well as of myself, respectfully ask Congress to strictly adhere to its policy concerning this matter, as it has been defined in the "organic act."

Mr. Chairman, I now ask unanimous consent to print as a part of my remarks a petition for the immediate independence of the Philippine Islands, addressed to Congress and signed by

myself. The matter of Philippine independence is, so far, the only question for the Filipinos, and I hope Congress will give it due consideration.

In delivering this message to Congress I have the great honor and satisfaction of complying with an especial mandate given to me by the Philippine assembly.

PETITION FOR IMMEDIATE INDEPENDENCE.

MAY 14, 1910.

To the Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States in Congress assembled:

The undersigned, Resident Commissioner of the Philippine Islands in the United States, in pursuance of instructions from the Philippine assembly, has the honor hereby to address the Congress of the United States on behalf of the Filipino people, to the end that Congress may grant complete and absolute independence to all the territory known as the Philippine Archipelago, and request the President of the United States to open negotiations with Japan, China, England, Germany, Russia, and France for the neutralization of said archipelago.

This petition is strictly in accord with the policy of the United States with regard to the Philippines, as stated by the present Chief Executive, who, when Secretary of War, said:

"When the people as a whole show themselves reasonably fit to conduct a popular self-government, maintaining law and order and offering equal protection of the laws and civil rights to rich and poor, and desire complete independence of the United States, they shall be given it."

For nearly twelve years the Filipino people have been undergoing with undeniable success the test of their ability to conduct a popular self-government, maintain law and order, and offer equal protection of the laws and civil rights to the rich and the poor, and they unanimously desire complete independence of the United States.

THE FILIPINOS ARE CAPABLE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT.

Scarcely had the war between the Philippines and the United States come to an end—the roar of battle still sounding over the fields of Luzon and the blood of two gallant armies locked in struggle, each in the name of liberty, had not yet been absorbed by the fertile soil of the Philippines—when the American Government in the islands established a system of municipal government analogous to that which exists in the United States.

The Filipino people, most anxious to demonstrate their governing capacity, elected their municipal officers in the place, time, and manner required by law, without the slightest public disorder, and without even the local disturbances which frequently occur during the excitement of an electoral campaign, even in countries more experienced in the exercise of political franchises. Intelligent and high-minded men were elected in every municipality to discharge the duties of municipal government, and they qualified themselves as splendid officials and patriots. The same thing occurred when the provincial governments were organized and the Filipinos called upon to elect their provincial officers. Both municipal and provincial governments have successfully met the test to which they were subjected, public order reigns throughout the entire Philippine archipelago, local justice is dispensed everywhere alike to the rich and the poor, municipal and provincial schools established and maintained, and means of communication properly organized. The Filipinos were invited to furnish to the Government men who, with arms in their hands and at the risk of their own life, were disposed to fight in those far-off islands for the ever glorious flag of the United States, and from every province came young men full of life and courage to serve in the ranks as constables or scouts, who, on many occasions, rivaled in bravery the American soldier. The people were invited to learn the language of their Government in control, and, in spite of the difficulties connected with the study of every foreign language, increased manifold by the peculiar ones of the English language, hundreds of thousands of children and a large number of grown men devoted themselves to the study of that useful, but difficult, language with such brilliant success that to-day it can be safely said that the knowledge of the English language is more extended throughout the islands than ever was that of Spanish. In fact, the thirst for learning exists even in the most inaccessible corners of the archipelago, and the Philippine treasury is unable to meet the demand made upon it by that people, so desirous of increasing their knowledge. The people were given opportunity to take part in the administration of justice, and from among them were appointed all the justices of the peace and provincial fiscals (prosecuting attorneys) throughout the islands, almost one-half of the judges of the courts of first instance and of the justices of the supreme court, of which latter distinguished tribunal a Filipino is the chief justice; and the Filipinos who have occupied these positions have, by their impartiality and wisdom, lent just renown and prestige to the Philippine judiciary.

Filipinos have been appointed in the executive branch of the government, and they have fulfilled their duties with scrupulous care and much ability. Finally, the people were given the right to elect their representatives to the Philippine assembly, a body which, together with the commission, was to share the grave and difficult task of legislating for the islands. With the same order, with the same honesty of purpose with which the municipal and provincial elections had been carried on, the election for members of the assembly took place. Eighty Filipinos, members of the learned professions, industrial workers, agriculturists, and business men, all of them intelligent and patriotic citizens, without other ends in view than the welfare of their countrymen and the glory of their fatherland, took their seats in the assembly, and under the guidance of the able and illustrious Speaker Osmena performed their duties to the entire satisfaction of the people and to the astonishment of the government. The first law enacted by the assembly, which was an appropriation bill for school purposes, is enough to glorify forever that body, and shows the progressive spirit of the Filipinos.

The success thus obtained by the Filipino people has been officially recognized by governors-general of the islands and by both the former and the present incumbent of the Presidency of the United States, all of whom in speaking of the Filipino officials have praised and complimented them in the highest terms.

Governor-General Forbes said in his inaugural speech:

"I want no better men than the present officers and employees of the government, both Americans and Filipinos. They compare favorably with any set of men I have ever seen, both as regards ability and fidelity to duty."

Ex-Governor-General Smith, in a message to the Philippine legislature, said:

"The administration of provincial governments has been very satisfactory."

President Taft, testifying before the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House, stated:

"The Philippine judiciary is worthy to be compared with the judiciary of any State of the United States."

And President Roosevelt, in a message to Congress, spoke in the most laudatory terms of the work of the first Philippine assembly.

THE FILIPINOS ARE UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE WHOLE ARCHIPELAGO.

In the first general election held in the islands, to select representatives for the Philippine assembly, two political parties were entered—the nationalist party, which declared for the actual capacity of the Filipino people to govern themselves and asserted their desire for immediate independence, and the progresista party, which advocated temporary control of the islands by the American Government.

When the electoral returns were in, out of a total of 80 representatives but 15 belonged to the progresista party; the rest were nationalists. In this way the Filipino people declared in unmistakable language that they deemed themselves capable of self-government and desired their political freedom.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE ASSEMBLY.

As if this declaration were not sufficient to make known the sentiments and aspirations of the people, the nationalist members of the first assembly adopted a resolution requesting that the United States Congress grant immediate independence to the Philippine Islands. Said resolution is as follows:

"Whereas the Philippine assembly as the legitimate representative of the Filipino people must be the faithful echo of what the latter thinks and feels; and

"Whereas the Philippine nation, being positively convinced that it possesses the actual capacity for self-government as a civilized nation, aspires ardently to be independent, and, trusting in the justice and in the tradition of the Nation that now directs the fate and destiny of the Filipinos, anxiously hopes to obtain it as soon as practicable—immediately, if that be possible—from the Congress of the United States of America; and

"Whereas in behalf of the good of the Philippines it is necessary that the Congress of the United States of America be informed by the people of the Philippines itself concerning the points stated above: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Philippine assembly shall, by means of a memorial, lay at once and without delay before the Congress of the United States of America the said aptitude, desire, and expectation of the Philippine nation."

WORDS OF THE SPEAKER.

In addition to this, Speaker Osmeña, an extraordinarily able man and our most popular statesman, in an address to the house delivered at the close of the first regular session of the first assembly, said in part:

"We Filipinos desire national independence, a desire existing before our second uprising against Spain and continuing thereafter equally under the shock of arms and the signs of peace. We believe ourselves capable of ruling our own destinies. The phrase 'Immediate independence,' inscribed upon the banner of the majority, is neither a new inscription nor a new ideal. 'Immediate independence' is the motto of our country to-day and her motto forever, for it incarnates and signifies her true aspiration, that aspiration which has suffered neither change nor decay and which her children through all vicissitudes and adversities have never forgotten for a single moment; ay, not even in the moment of swearing allegiance, for that allegiance involves no repudiation of our ideals, and we believe allegiance to America still permits us to be faithful to our conscience as men and to our sacred desire for national independence.

"Permit me, gentlemen of the chamber, to declare solemnly before God and before the world, upon my conscience as a deputy and representative of my compatriots, and under my responsibility as president of this chamber, that we believe the people desire independence, that it believes itself capable of leading an orderly existence, efficient both in internal and external affairs, as a member of the free and civilized nations; and that we believe that if at this moment the United States should grant the suit of the Filipino people for liberty, it could discharge to the full its obligations toward itself and toward others, without detriment to liberty, to law, or to justice."

The above resolution and address were endorsed by the municipalities of the Philippines.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE PROGRESISTA PARTY.

Again, the Progresista party, which heretofore maintained that a temporary control of the islands by the Government of the United States was necessary, a short time since changed its attitude and adopted the following resolution addressed to the Congress of the United States and in favor of the independence of the Philippine Islands:

"Whereas during the twelve years of American sovereignty in the Philippine Islands, several resolutions, among those introduced by Senators BACON, TILLMAN, and STONE and by Representatives MCALL, WILLIAMS, BURGESS, HARDWICK, and SLAYDEN, were presented to the Congress of the United States for the purpose of obtaining from said Congress an express and definite declaration that it is not the intention of the American people to retain indefinitely the Philippine Islands, but to aid the Filipino people in establishing their national independence;

"Whereas such resolutions have met with the unanimous approval of the whole Filipino people;

"Whereas the attitude of a great majority of American citizens residing in the Philippine Islands, maintaining that a perpetual American sovereignty over these islands is the only means to induce the investment of American as well as foreign capital, thereby impliedly asserting that the Filipino people would never be able to set up a government that would give the necessary protection and security, has given rise to a profound concern in the minds of the Filipinos as to the final political destiny of their country;

"Whereas the prestige of the administration in the Philippines and the peace of mind of the Filipinos demand from the Congress of the United States a formal declaration or express promise, assuring them their political independence and the integrity of their territory;

"Whereas with such a promise or formal declaration the Filipino people would look forward with more confidence to their future, work out with more faith their progress, and cooperate with more enthusiasm for the advancement of the American policy in the Philippine Islands, thereby establishing and insuring the necessary harmony between Americans and Filipinos;

"Whereas the Philippine Islands, being a mere dependency of the United States, are and will, because of this status, be exposed to trans-

fer of sovereignty, alienation, and dismemberment by virtue of treaties and diplomatic settlements and agreements, or of any other arrangements;

"Whereas it is not probable that any foreign power will claim or assert sovereignty over, or acquire title to, the Philippines or any part thereof if the right of Filipinos to independent national life is formally recognized and declared by the Congress of the United States;

"Whereas a declaration by Congress to the effect that the Philippine Islands are not a mere dependency of the United States, but a nation placed under her tutelage and honor, entitled to a free and independent existence, would protect this country from the danger of the transfer referred to or any other ulterior disposition;

"Whereas the absence of such a declaration causes some of the Filipino people to believe that American sovereignty will be permanent, and others that independence of the Philippines is a question dependent upon a few prominent men in public life and upon political parties in the United States, rather than wholly upon the will of the American people;

"Whereas such a declaration would be in accord with the principles of the Declaration of Independence of the United States, as well as with the history and traditions of the great Republic; would clearly and unequivocally confirm the personal promises and official declarations of Presidents McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft; and, while honorable to the people of the United States, would put an end to the present uncertainty and disquietude of the Filipino people;

"Therefore, we, the delegates of the National Progressive party, in general convention assembled, unanimously

Resolve, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully petitioned for an express and solemn declaration that it is the unswerving purpose and intention of the United States to grant the Filipino people their independence; that American sovereignty over these islands is temporary; that it is the desire of the people of the United States to deliver to the Filipino people when independence is granted the whole territory known at present as the Philippine Islands; and that it is not her intention to cede, alienate, or transfer them, in whole or in part, now or at any time hereafter; and it is further respectfully petitioned that this declaration of the Congress be communicated to the powers."

NEUTRALIZATION OF THE PHILIPPINES.

As a safeguard of the independence of the Philippines, the Filipinos ask of the American people their good offices in favor of the neutralization of the islands. The Filipinos firmly believe that in order to consummate the great work inaugurated by the United States in those islands she will not refuse to take the necessary steps to bring about the agreements of the great nations of the world for the neutralization of the archipelago.

The distinguished American, Hon. Moorfield Storey, discussing this matter before the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House, said:

"That it is feasible to obtain such an agreement is, I think, hardly doubtful. In the first place, if we ask the powers of the world to make this agreement with us we are not asking them to give us anything. The Philippine Islands in their eyes now belong to us. They are not subjects for foreign aggression. To interfere with them means war with us, and that is what no foreign power is at present seeking. Therefore when we ask them to agree, if we decide that it is proper to give the Filipinos their independence, they will keep their hands off. We are asking them to give nothing.

"The request, if made now, is made at a peculiarly favorable time. There never was in the history of the world a time when the friendship of the United States was so much desired by everybody as it is at this moment. There are many of us who come down from a former generation who remember the time during the civil war when the relations between this country and England, this country and France, this country and Germany were strained; when we felt that we were constantly living under the shadow of their interference in our affairs; when the greatest service that could be rendered was to persuade them to keep their hands off; and the feeling in this country against those nations was extremely bitter. But to-day Japan certainly wishes to cooperate with us, and she recognizes the friendship that we have shown her in the recent war with Russia. Russia would be anxious to be our friend if possible, and a reformed Russia will find us a warm friend. Germany has shown her desire to be friendly with us by her recent action about the tariff. France and England are certainly each anxious to preserve their present relations with us; and if this country were to ask them simply to make this agreement, I am perfectly certain that there would be no objection. If we said that we wanted this thing we should get it.

"Moreover, what we are dealing with, that which we are afraid of, is not so much the anxiety on the part of any foreign nation to take the Philippine Islands because it wants the islands as it is the fear that one nation may take them in order to prevent another nation from taking them. England once owned and controlled these islands, but she let them go voluntarily. Spain owned and controlled them, and, I fancy, was very glad to get rid of them. Certainly the figures show that her prosperity since we have had her colonies is much greater than when she had them. Our own experience with them has not been such as to make another nation regard them as a peculiarly tempting morsel. Probably if England should be assured that Germany would not get them, and Germany that France would not get them, and France that no other foreign power would get them, they would be glad to agree that these islands should become independent. They would be protected by an international agreement against their being absorbed by any rival.

"This result is in accordance with perfectly established diplomatic precedents. The independence of Holland, clear back to the treaty of Utrecht, has been protected by international agreement. The independence of Belgium was guaranteed in 1839, the independence of Switzerland in 1813, and I could give you a long list of similar agreements whereby certain small powers have been made independent, and, by the consent of their stronger neighbors, have been protected against aggression."

Respectfully submitted.

MANUEL L. QUEZON,
Resident Commissioner in the United States
from the Philippine Islands.

Gentlemen, in reading this memorial, by which, though its language be inadequate, over 8,000,000 people seek from you that which it will cost you nothing to concede, I beg you to remember that they ask of you something which is, and ever will be, more to them than wealth and life—their liberty.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I find by reference to the RECORD that up to this time there have during the present Congress been introduced in the House 25,897 bills and in the Senate 8,219, making a total of 34,116 bills introduced since the convening of the first session of the present Congress; and yet there are people who believe that Members of Congress waste their time sitting around and doing nothing.

The bill now under consideration is No. 25,552, and is somewhat voluminous, containing 189 printed pages and proposing to appropriate for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the next fiscal year more than \$111,000,000.

I do not desire at this time to discuss in detail the provisions of this bill, but shall confine myself during the few minutes that I occupy the attention of the House to a discussion of one single provision, which is as follows:

To enable the President to secure information as to the effect of tariff rates or other restrictions, exactions, or any regulations imposed at any time by any foreign country on the importation into or sale in any such foreign country of any agricultural, manufactured, or other product of the United States, and to assist the officers of the Government in the administration of the customs laws, as required by the tariff act approved August 5, 1909, including detailed information of the cost and of each and every element thereof of producing at the place of production and at the place of consumption of all articles specified in said tariff act, both in this country and in the country from which such articles are imported, so that the cost of all such articles produced abroad may be compared with the cost of like articles produced in this country, the President in the employment of persons required and authorized for such service may appoint a tariff board, and he may also employ under his personal direction, or under the direction and supervision of such tariff board, such competent experts in the business and methods of cost keeping, and such clerical and other personal services, including rent of offices in the District of Columbia, traveling and other incidental expenses, as may be necessary in the work of said board and the work of said experts engaged in such investigations; and the compensation of all such persons, whether employed permanently or temporarily, shall be fixed by the President; and to enable the President to have such information classified, tabulated, and arranged for his use in recommending to Congress such changes or modifications in any existing tariff duties as he may deem necessary, to prevent undue discrimination in favor of or against any of the products of the United States, \$250,000.

I am very decidedly in favor of the enactment of this provision, believing that it will do more than anything ever heretofore done to equalize and adjust tariff rates to the changing conditions of the business and growth of the country. I fully believe with the President that the tariff law enacted by the present Congress is the best tariff law, all things considered, that has ever been enacted by the Congress of the United States, and yet I do not believe for a moment that the present law is perfect in all its details, and I do not believe but what, with proper information, many of the schedules might be improved upon and made more just and equitable. I am not at all sure that the method of enacting tariff legislation heretofore pursued is the best method to pursue. It seems to me that many of the ills which undoubtedly do occur in tariff legislation result from necessary compromises between different and conflicting interests, and it is my opinion, which I have long entertained, that with a competent tariff board to make special recommendations, based on the cost of production abroad and at home, such board might recommend special changes, which could be made without revising the entire tariff laws of the country, and I believe that is the best method to pursue. It too often happens in a revision of the entire tariff law that it is necessary for one section of the country or for one interest to make concessions to another section of the country or to other interests which, for the general good of the whole country, ought not to be made. It has been objected that it would be impossible to amend one schedule of the tariff law without opening up the whole question to amendment in the House and Senate. I believe that could be remedied by providing a rule under which amendments not germane to the section or schedule proposed to be amended should not be in order, thereby limiting the question to the consideration of the one amendment proposed.

I am not sure but that a point of order will lie against the provision for this proposed tariff board, on the ground that it is new legislation and should not be embodied in an appropriation bill. I hope, however, that no such point of order will be made, and I hope that all Members of the House will see the advisability of settling this question once for all in the manner proposed by the President. The question of the tariff has too long been a football between political parties. It ought to be settled each time on a purely business basis and for the interests of the entire country, without special regard for any particular section or for any particular interest or business. People are naturally selfish, and they desire to secure for themselves, for their own business, and for their own section the very best tariff rates obtainable.

I read a short time ago the platform on which a candidate for Congress in a Massachusetts district submitted his claims to the people, and as I understood it, he favored a protective tariff on all manufactured products in which that district was

largely interested, and favored free trade in raw materials, all agricultural products, and reciprocity with Canada, so that his section of the country could have protection on their manufactures and at the same time be enabled to purchase their meats and their flour and their butter and their eggs and their poultry from Canada without the imposition of any tariff duties for the protection of the western farmer and producer. That might have sounded all very well to his constituents, but it does not sound well to mine. If we in the great Middle West and in the great agricultural regions of the country concede a protective tariff, which we do, to the manufacturers of New England, we insist upon like protection for the products of our region, and how else could we buy their products unless we are able to sell to them our own products? If they desire to purchase their supplies, their farm products, their provisions, whatever they consume, under a free-trade policy, from Canada, then they should also look to Canada for the market for their products, because they can not expect that the West will be customers of theirs unless the West has equal protection with them.

There are three, perhaps four, principles which govern the making of a tariff law. The first which I will enumerate is a free trade or tariff for revenue only, without any element of protection to American industries or American labor. To this I am most emphatically opposed. I do not believe that under a system of that kind the high average wage of the American laboring man or the high standard of living now universal can be maintained.

The second kind of a tariff law would be one granting protection to American manufacturers and American industries governed as nearly as possible by the difference in cost of the manufacture or product in this country and in the country from which such manufactures or products were imported. This would place the home labor and the home producer precisely on a level with the manufacturer or producer from abroad and would give no advantage to our own people over the people of other countries, and to such a tariff I am opposed.

The third plan would be to grant such a measure of protection as covers the difference between the cost of production abroad and at home, maintaining our own high standard of wages and high standard of living, and also affording to the manufacturer or producer a reasonable profit as an advantage to him over the foreign manufacturer or producer. This is the kind of a tariff in which I believe.

The fourth would be a high protective tariff, so high as to prevent all competition between our own people and those of other countries, and to this I am opposed.

I believe that the tariff should be so adjusted as to protect American labor, so as to maintain our own high standard of wages, and so as to permit the American laboring man to live on a higher plane than the laborer of any other country in the world. That is the Republican doctrine, as I understand it, and I believe that by the enactment of this provision in the sundry civil bill, which I have quoted, we shall accomplish more than has ever been accomplished heretofore in settling the tariff question for all time, and so that there need be no further disturbance of business by continued talk about a revision of all the schedules of the tariff law.

Under the Republican doctrine as I have outlined it and under the tariff acts of the Republican party this country has prospered as no other country ever prospered in the history of the world. The tariff law enacted by the present Congress has been misrepresented to the people of this country willfully and maliciously. It is the best revenue producer we have ever had. There is a substantial reduction downward of the former tariff law. More goods are being imported under this law than ever before, and at the same time the revenues are constantly increasing.

I am not sure that a policy which permits of the importation of large quantities of manufactured goods from abroad in competition with our own industries is very much of a benefit to the people of this country, because we must all recognize the fact that in such articles as we produce we are able to supply all our people with our home labor, and that all things considered it is better that the cost of manufacture, that the cost of production, should be paid to the laboring man of our own land instead of to the laboring men of other lands. Just in proportion as the imports are increased, just in that proportion are the citizens of our own land deprived of remunerative labor which might have gone into the manufacture of those same articles at home. Mere cheapness is not always desirable. When wages are high and money is plenty the people are enabled to buy. When wages are low and money is scarce they are not able to buy so much. Just in proportion as we send money abroad to buy the manufactured products of other countries, just in that proportion do our own people suffer.

I hope to see this provision in the sundry civil bill enacted. I do not believe that any Republican or Democratic Member of this House can afford to object to this wise provision and go before the people and defend his vote on that question. It should be adopted unanimously.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, world federation as a means of securing peace and of ridding humanity of the burdens and atrocities of war is to-day challenging the attention of American diplomacy. It is gratifying to know that the American people are awake to the importance of having our country take the lead in a movement that in the fullness of time is certain to revolutionize the world. There appeared this week in the Independent an editorial entitled "The federation of the world." The article is so timely and so suggestive that I venture to reproduce it in the RECORD.

THE FEDERATION OF THE WORLD.

We print elsewhere in this issue Theodore Roosevelt's address on "International peace," delivered last week before the Nobel Peace Committee, at Christiania, Norway. Its importance can hardly be overestimated, for it comes at a time when all Christendom is groaning under the excessive weight of armaments and when the nations are seeking substitutes for war in the development of Hague courts and conferences. Mr. Roosevelt's address is nothing less than a plea for the federation of the world. Not since the "great design" of Henry IV of France, proposed at the beginning of the seventeenth century, has one who has represented a great people ever promulgated so comprehensive a plan for universal peace.

We are pleased to remember that in our editorial of February 17, entitled "Mr. Roosevelt at Christiania," we pointed out the unparalleled opportunity before our ex-President to hunt for bigger game than he had yet met since he left our shores. We suggested that, inasmuch as he has penetrated the philosophy of arbitration farther than any living ruler, and has already said that "effective arbitration necessitates agreements between all the powers to respect each other's territory and sovereignty and to arbitrate all other questions," it was fitting that he should urge the nations to negotiate treaties with such guarantees. We also remarked that our Supreme Court furnishes the model to be followed in the development of the Hague court, and, in fine, that the Constitution of the United States is the key to the establishment of the united nations. Pending such a universal world federation, we thought that a league of peace, based on force if necessary, would be a long and practical step in the right direction.

It will be seen how we have anticipated Mr. Roosevelt's appeal. But for a practical statesman of his prestige and power to promulgate such views is more far-reaching than the editorial utterance of any periodical. It shows that at last the peace movement has entered practical politics and from henceforth is destined to become the great political issue before the nations.

Now, what does Mr. Roosevelt propose? He proposes a world federation limited to the maintenance of peace, composed of those great civilized nations who are sincerely desirous of peace and willing to use force if necessary to preserve it. This is a thoroughly practical suggestion, and has been urged before, especially by Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Bartholdt. Even Jose B. Ordonez, ex-President of Uruguay, at the second Hague conference made a similar suggestion in his official capacity as first delegate of his country. Curiously enough, there is a bill at the present moment pending before Congress to the same effect.

It resolves that a commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States, the duties of whom shall be:

"First. To urge upon the attention of other governments the fact that relief from the heavy burden of military expenditures and from the disasters of war can best be obtained by the establishment of an international federation.

"Second. To report to Congress, as soon as practicable, a draft of articles of a federation limited to the maintenance of peace, through the establishment of a court having power to determine by decree all controversies between nations, and to enforce execution of its decrees by the arms of the federation, such arms to be provided to the federation and controlled solely by it.

"Third. To consider and report on any other means to diminish the expenses of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war."

This bill should be passed. The creation of such a commission would be a guaranty to our own people, as well as to the peoples of the world, that the United States is in earnest and ready to take the lead in the only practical and promising method of obtaining international peace. There is little enough time before the third Hague Conference convenes, in 1915, for such a commission to visit and sound the chancelleries of the world and report back some practical plan to serve as the basis for the action of the American delegates at the third conference. The chief trouble at the first and second Hague conferences was that the delegates came there more or less unprepared. A commission originating in the popular branch of Congress and appointed by the President would remedy this defect. Moreover, it would go to the world with more prestige than a similar commission under the auspices of the State Department alone. And why should not Theodore Roosevelt himself be made chairman of the commission? He believes in the plan, he is the best known and esteemed American abroad, he has the prestige, energy, ability, and youth. Does not the last clause in the last sentence of his Nobel address indicate that he would feel compelled to accept an appointment for such a service? He says: "But the ruler or statesman who should bring about such a combination (league of peace) would have earned his place in history for all time and his title to the gratitude of all mankind."

Emanuel Kant has written that we can never have universal peace until the world is politically organized, and it will never be possible to organize the world until the majority of the nations have a representative form of government. The history of the United States is a demonstration of the truth of this. Public sentiment has already passed the stages of conciliation and even arbitration. It is now ready for world federation. Will the United States, therefore, take the lead? The time is ripe. We have the prestige. We have also the man.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH].

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of historic accuracy alone I ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments to reply to certain remarks made a few weeks ago—March 26, 1910—by the honorable gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SPIGHT] for whom I certainly entertain due and proper regard.

I was temporarily absent from the Hall, or I should, at the time, have called his attention to his inaccuracy of historic statement, giving him the opportunity of making corrections himself, and should have wholly ignored his personal remarks and flings at myself, as I have often had occasion to do from similar sources in the South.

He was good enough, as I learn from the printed record, to tell the House in plain language, after a little harmless attempt at muck-raking, that his remarks were intended as a reply to a speech of mine appearing in the RECORD of February 24. It was well that he did this, for otherwise no one of ordinary intelligence who had read my speech would have suspected such purpose on his part. His remarks were certainly not apropos in reply to anything I had said.

My personal acquaintance with the honorable gentleman is not extensive, having, as he was careful to state, only been a Member of the House about a year; but I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that he has not, during this time, received aught from me but kindness and deferential consideration for his longer and doubtless more valuable services in Congress, judging by his own standard.

At the extra session last year, after a somewhat testy but successful objection made in the House against a personal privilege I sought, to orally explain or print in the RECORD a brief explanation of a resolution I had submitted protesting against the display of confederate emblems, notably a portrait engraving of Jefferson Davis, on one of our United States battle ships, he voluntarily called at my office and we had a friendly and, to me at least, satisfactory talk over the incident.

We shook hands and, as I remember, parted as friends. I never suspected anything to the contrary until I read his somewhat churlish reference to my want of experience in Congress, and suggesting that my speech was "born" out of season, and so forth. His secondhand witticism about hoping that I felt relieved after its delivery, borrowed from Senator BANKHEAD's humorous reference to a patriotic speech recently delivered by Senator HEYBURN, did not impress me seriously, except as a very small plagiarism to cover a very big deficit in original wit.

However this may be, Mr. Chairman, I certainly acquit him of any intention to be personally offensive.

His exploitation of his own soldierly qualities is excusable. Any brave soldier, such as he must have been from his own statements, may do this without criticism. His glorification of the military leaders under whom he served in a hostile army until our beloved land was near to the brink of destruction may also be pardoned in one of his early training and evident environment.

No one asks or expects the southern people to forget their heroes. It is a proper sentiment to cherish their memories. All this I conceded in the address to which my friend says he undertook to reply.

It is printed in the RECORD of February 24, and I challenge any fair-minded friend of the South to find in it an offensive word or sentiment calculated to wound the feelings of any true-hearted American citizen. It breathes only of peace, hope, good will, and justice to all mankind. Only a muck-raker in a garden of flowers could imagine anything to the contrary.

I am not surprised, therefore, that the honorable gentleman found it necessary to conjure up imaginary wrongs to which he might seem to reply.

He does, however, in addition to exploiting his own bravery and long service in the army of his choice, make some statements which are likely to be questioned by the impartial readers of American history, to whom he professes to appeal. He calls loudly for a vindication of the truth of history, and challenges my statement, which he correctly quotes, to the effect that "only one man, Jefferson Davis, of all the confederacy, spurned the Government's generous proffer to restore forfeited citizenship."

He attempts to refute this by suggesting that a man of Mr. Davis's "high sense of honor" could not accept clemency without forgetting his "manhood" and proving "recrulant to the people who had trusted him." I quote further from the exact words of my friend's attempted denial of my statement:

In the proclamation of President Andrew Johnson, dated May 9, 1865, just one month after the surrender at Appomattox, about ten days after the surrender of the army under Gen. Joseph E. Johnston at Greensboro, N. C., before the surrender of the last of the confederate armies, and before the capture of Mr. Davis, amnesty was denied to Mr. Davis and quite a number of other confederate officials.

I assume, Mr. Chairman, that this reference is as it must have been to the first proclamation of amnesty which, according to the official copy as it appears on page 310, volume 6, of the printed messages and papers of the Presidents, published by authority of Congress, was May 29, 1865, instead of May 9 as stated, but this slight mistake or inadvertence can not affect the essential facts of history, except as it may spoil and render futile the gentleman's bitter arraignment of President Johnson for having issued such proclamation "before the surrender of the last of the confederate armies and before the capture of Mr. Davis," which capture took place May 10, 1865.

It might also have added somewhat to the correctness of his "vindication of the truth of history," the "whole truth," which he says he wants to have known "for all time," if he had "fairly and accurately" quoted the whole of what he calls "a later clause" in this same proclamation to the effect that any of the excepted classes, including Mr. Davis, might apply individually for pardon, and the generous promise of President Johnson in relation thereto that "clemency would be liberally extended."

He might also in fairness have mentioned a later proclamation of September 7, 1865, extending amnesty to all, had he desired to deal justly with Mr. Johnson's memory and justify his own words in saying that he would "withhold nothing." Can it be possible that my critical friend has overlooked this later proclamation entirely as he seems to have done the correct date of the first one, or has his zeal outrun his judgment?

Besides, it must be remembered that Mr. Johnson was a southern man, born and bred. He early espoused the Union cause, and with that bitterness of heart sometimes felt toward deserted friends, he proclaimed a harsh political creed to the effect that "traitors must be punished and treason be made odious." It was known, however, that he could only occupy for a few years the great office to which he succeeded on the assassination of the pure and gentle Lincoln. He was harmless in his wrath. He was opposed by a Republican Congress, and by General Grant who followed him as President.

I have no excuses at this late date for the harshness of Andrew Johnson's early utterances. As President, however, he soon lost his bitterness of heart and in turn deserted his new-found friends, those who had honored him with an election to the Vice-Presidency. He attempted to return to his old associates in the South, but it would seem from the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi that the South never forgave him for his services to the Union cause.

General Grant, whose loving words of peace my friend quotes approvingly, succeeded to the Presidency in 1869, but Jefferson Davis chose to live on in silent isolation, a voluntary alien in the land of his birth. Surely he had no cause then to fear or resent President Johnson's proclamation of 1865.

"The doors of citizenship" were held wide open for him by President Grant and later Presidents of like generous impulses, but Mr. Davis heeded them not, stubbornly continuing on in his unique position, the "man without a country," in the new rich life of the American Nation, until in 1889 the angel of death touched him and ended forever his voluntary exile.

Requiescat in pace to his memory, *not esto perpetua*, as the gentleman from Mississippi classically suggests.

Verily my friend doth protest too much.

Robert E. Lee was supposed to be a man of a "high sense of honor," and yet long before his death he renewed his citizenship and became a useful member of the body politic. Did he in that act become "a traitor to his own people?"

So I would inquire as to Joseph E. Johnston, Bureaugard, Wheeler, Longstreet, Walthall, Cockrell, John B. Gordon, and other famous confederate leaders, who after defeat chose to follow their patriotic impulses and voluntarily become a part and parcel of the glorious citizenship of our reunited country.

What of their "honor?" What of their "manhood?"

Even my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, must have early satisfied his own scruples about "honor," as the Congressional Directory shows that he has occupied various offices requiring him to take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, including the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments, for a period covering in the aggregate over a quarter of a century since he and Joseph E. Johnston surrendered at Greensboro in 1865.

Is he not a man of high "honor" and "manhood?" His election without opposition to Congress on a total vote of 7,511 in his district is a sufficient answer in the affirmative.

What then becomes of the gentleman's suggestion about Mr. Davis's supercilious notions of honor? It is a barren ideal.

Nor can I, Mr. Chairman, agree with another statement of the honorable gentleman from Mississippi, when, in speaking of Mr. Davis's imprisonment, he says that "the brutality of this treat-

ment there (Mr. Davis's confinement in Fortress Monroe) has never been equaled in all civilized history."

I think myself that the Government might have safely turned Mr. Davis loose with his wife and family, after his somewhat embarrassing, if not ludicrous, capture, but it was a time of great stress and excitement, only a few days after the surrender of the main bodies of the confederate army. Nobody then knew what the end might be. Guerrilla warfare had been threatened. There were rumors also, as the gentleman himself suggests, not well founded, thank God, for the good name of American civilization, of the confederate president's complicity in the assassination of President Lincoln and in the Wirz atrocities at Andersonville.

But, admitting Mr. Davis's incarceration to have been a mistake, does that justify the words of my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, as to its superlative brutality? I think not. The horrors of Andersonville and other southern prisons rise up to refute a thousand times over such inconsiderate calumny against the prison management of the United States Government. As compared with the atrocities referred to of Major Wirz, to whom a monument has recently been erected in the South, Mr. Davis's imprisonment was most humane and considerate.

But let all such grewsome subjects pass; they do not belong to present-day controversies.

The honorable gentleman in his heat also garbles a quotation from my speech, and then characterizes it as "a gratuitous, unprovoked slander of all the people of the South." As quoted by him it follows:

Silently and insidiously, night and day, in the schools, churches, and other organizations for the control of public sentiment in the South, the leaven of distrust and discontent seems to be constantly working.

I am unwilling, Mr. Chairman, that the honorable gentleman shall thus, or by his further unsupported statement that I thereby "indicted all the women and all the girls, all the men and all the boys, all the preachers and all their congregations in the South," put me in a false light in his self-styled attempt "to vindicate the truth of history," and so I here repeat in ungarbled form the whole quotation:

Silently and insidiously, night and day, in the schools, churches, and other organizations for the control of public sentiment in the South, even here in the Halls of Congress, the leaven of distrust and discontent seems to be constantly working. The senseless cry of the "bloody shirt" is still heard repeated and reiterated as a complaint, although sensible people long ago recognized it as a mere ruse (a sort of stop-thief cry) to conceal southern hopes and designs.

Southern ideals are being revived; southern idols are being recanonized. What, I ask, does this mean? Are the results of the civil war to be undermined and destroyed? If not, why the pending resolutions in this Congress to nullify the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments? Why the scores and hundreds of bills introduced, forty-four years after the civil war, to pay for alleged damages in the Confederate States caused by the Union armies in the necessary prosecution of the war? Why all this commotion about a simple protest against making our battle ships places for the display of confederate emblems? Why the reported raising of a large fund to erect a confederate memorial at Arlington, eclipsing in size and magnificence any of the present monuments, if its purpose be not to establish a rival center for the annual display of confederate sentiment at a place peculiarly sacred to the memory of Union soldiers who lie buried there in such numbers that they and their widows and orphans have been rudely referred to as the greatest of all monuments to confederate valor and confederate honor? Why the recent demand that antislavery mottoes be removed from the walls of the Lee mansion by executive order?

"Distrust and discontent constantly working" against the recognized settlements of the war period. Are not these words expressive of real conditions everywhere in the southland? Do they not describe the simple truth wherever southern ideas are dominant? Are not the old idols and the old ideals of the confederacy being revived? No fair-minded man acquainted with conditions now pretends to doubt these facts. They are too apparent. Even here in the Halls of Congress, as I suggested in the extract which the gentleman omits from his quotation, evidences are painfully manifest on every hand.

I do not, Mr. Chairman, care to further continue my remarks. What I have said has been prompted solely by a sense of duty to truth and accuracy in the statement of historic facts.

I agree with the honorable gentleman in most of what he has said in laudation of the southern people, but I suggest a different personal application of his words when with seemingly overwrought nerves he assumes to state and insinuatingly apply to me a truism which no one doubts to the effect that "while it is easy to make a charge there ought to be some sort of evidence to sustain it."

A little introspection often relieves the mind of vagaries, and I commend it to my friend. We are all prone to overlook the beam in our own eye while magnifying the mote in that of a brother.

The honorable gentleman, like many others of his class in the South, does himself an injustice in shutting his eyes to the

actual beauty of northern sentiment, to the real helpful friendship and generous, impulsive good will of the North toward the South in all matters except those believed to be vital to our republican form of government, such as the constitutional amendments, and in blind stubbornness attempting by irregular methods to strike down these great safeguards of the people.

He reminds me not of a muck-raker, although there may be a relationship, but rather of a so-called "thorn hunter," one who in a garden of roses is said to close his eyes to the beautiful coloring of petals and bloom, his ears to the soft notes of the song birds, and his nostrils to the sweet-scented fragrance of perfume-laden air, while he blindly clutches underneath to seize and crush the thorn protections of the bush.

The analogy between the thorn-pointed guards of a rosebush and the vital points of a constitutional guaranty may be slight, but it is, I hope, sufficient to point the attention of my friend to the truth of the poet's words:

There's no dearth of kindness
In this world of ours;
Only in our blindness
We gather thorns for flowers.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

[Mr. BURNETT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. DALZELL, Speaker pro tempore, having taken the chair, Mr. MANN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 25552) and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 8014. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

S. 7610. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. TAWNEY (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting report of Special Agent John M. Turner on the flour trade in Porto Rico (H. Doc. No. 912)—to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting report of Capt. Godfrey L. Carden on machine-tool trade in Austria-Hungary, Denmark, Russia, and The Netherlands (H. Doc. No. 913)—to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Attorney-General, relative to friar lands in the Philippine Islands (H. Doc. No. 911)—to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the House of May 12, 1910, asking information relative to combinations to advance the price of wheat in May and July, 1909, and advancing or reducing the price of cotton (H. Doc. No. 910)—to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. OLMSTED, from the Committee on Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25641) providing for the quadrennial election of members of the Philippine legislature and Resident Commissioners to the United States, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1358), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 25771) granting an increase of pension to William B. Norman, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 25898) providing for the erection of a monument at St. Joseph, Mich., commemorating the establishment of Fort Miami on the site of said city—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MCCREDIE: A bill (H. R. 25899) to provide for allotments to certain members of the Squaxin tribe of Indians, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 25900) to confirm New Madrid location and survey No. 2880, and to provide for the issue of a patent therefor—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 694) seeking information as to national direction and supervision of drainage in Florida—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Resolution (H. Res. 695) directing the Secretary of War to furnish certain information to the House—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Resolution (H. Res. 696) providing for a change in the hour of convening of the daily sessions of the House—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 42) authorizing adjournment of the second session of the Sixty-first Congress—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 25901) granting an increase of pension to Henry Zender—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 25902) for the relief of James Carroll, alias James Clingen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25903) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Harriet L. Young, administratrix of the estate of Solomon Young, deceased—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 25904) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Kirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 25905) granting an increase of pension to Bruce F. Yeager—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 25906) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of J. B. Verdun, jr., administrator of Romain Verdun, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 25907) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 25908) for the relief of Lucy L. Bane—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 25909) granting an increase of pension to Michael Rigney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 25910) granting an increase of pension to Junius S. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 25911) granting an increase of pension to Allen W. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 25912) granting a pension to Georgie A. Ludwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 25913) for the relief of William H. Schriver—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLINGTON: A bill (H. R. 25914) granting an increase of pension to William M. Beeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 25915) granting a pension to Josephine Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS: A bill (H. R. 25916) granting a pension to Catharine M. Veach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOXLEY: A bill (H. R. 25917) granting an increase of pension to George W. Patrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 25918) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Garlits—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25919) granting an increase of pension to Albert B. Boone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25920) granting an increase of pension to Charles Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25921) granting an increase of pension to T. Elwood Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 25922) for the relief of Robert Downing—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 25923) granting an increase of pension to James H. Crosser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES: Petition of Chase Post, No. 5, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, of Titusville, Pa., against the Townsend bill, House bill 18899—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of E. E. Stout and others, of Townville, Pa., and Summit Grange, No. 1079, Patrons of Husbandry, of Erie County, Pa., in support of Senate bill 6931, providing an appropriation of \$500,000 to extend the work of improving the public highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Erie (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring House bill 13915, relative to the creation of a department of mines—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of Central Labor Union of Erie, Pa., for Senate bill 3731, relative to enforcement of eight-hour law for postal employees—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of citizens of Coalinga, Cal., relative to conservation of oil lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of National Lime Manufacturing Association, of Riverton, Va., against reduction of appropriation for Bureau of Standards—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of common council of Watervliet, N. Y., favoring the utilization of the arsenal for government work—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 25682) for relief of George Yocom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of salmon fishermen of Puget Sound, against federal control of the fisheries of the State of Washington—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of John K. Allen, president of the Ingenieria, in opposition to the establishment of the proposed department of public health, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of Irving Council, No. 602, Royal Arcanum, favoring House bill 17543—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of A. Stucki and V. P. Covell, favoring creation of a national bureau of mines—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of Allegheny County Medical Society, for the establishment of a national health bureau by the United States Government—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War, for Senate bill 2551, granting pensions to volunteer army nurses of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Engineers' Society of Western Pennsylvania, advocating retention of the test of structural materials with the newly formed bureau of mines and for increase of appropriation to \$150,000—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of P. H. Berga Company and 11 others, of Jackson; G. P. Griebel and 3 others, of Sherburn; and Farmers' Company and 4 others, of Lake Crystal, all in the State of Minnesota, favoring Senate bill 3776—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens in mass meeting at Bakersfield, Cal., on May 2, 1910, against the Pickett bill, rela-

tive to conservation of oil lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of residents of Englishtown, N. J., for Senate bill 6931, for an appropriation of \$500,000 for extension of work of the Office of Public Roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of board of education of Elizabeth, N. J., favoring extension of field work of Bureau of Education—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Jarrell Burrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELIHER: Petition of Boston Chamber of Commerce, against abolition of the long-and-short-haul features of the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petition of citizens of Romeo, Mich., protesting against any parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of members of the Ladies of the Maccabees of the World of Port Huron, Mich., favoring the amendment to House bill 21321—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MILLINGTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William M. Breman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Communication addressed to the Senate and House of Representatives, relating to limitation of agricultural lands which may be owned by one corporation—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Petition of citizens of Boonville, Mo., for plat of Daniel Hazel survey, No. 2880, township 49 north, range 17 west, south of the Missouri River—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Protests of H. E. Gortle and other citizens of Orion; Hoddrill Brothers and others, of Oxford; P. A. Wright & Co., of Holly; McCreedy & Myers and others, of Rochester; and E. M. Hovey and others, of Fenton, all in the State of Michigan, against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of the Hartford Yacht Club, of Hartford, Conn., favoring the bill to regulate motor boats—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of Every Tuesday Club and Woman's Club, of Rocky Ford, Colo., for Senate bill 6049, favoring a national health bureau—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

MONDAY, May 16, 1910.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Vice-President being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bacon	Clay	Hale	Page
Borah	Crane	Heyburn	Paynter
Bourne	Crawford	Hughes	Perkins
Bristow	Cummins	Johnston	Piles
Brown	Curtis	Jones	Rayner
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Simmons
Burkett	Elkins	Lodge	Smoot
Burrows	Frazier	Money	Stephenson
Burton	Frye	Nelson	Sutherland
Carter	Gallinger	Nixon	
Clapp	Gamble	Oliver	

Mr. JOHNSTON. I move that the Sergeant-at-Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators. I wish to say that this meeting at 11 o'clock seems not to have been observed by the gentlemen who supported the motion. The Senator who made the motion and the Senators who voted for it were conspicuously absent when the Senate met this morning. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Nothing is in order except the roll call.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thought the roll call had been concluded. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not concluded.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask that the absentees be called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absentees can not be called at present.